

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

rural development



5th, 1974

PLANNING SERIAL RECORDS

APR 6 '76

U.S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL
LIBRARY
DIVISION

Financial and Technical Assistance Provided by the
Department of Agriculture and the
Department of Housing and Urban Development
for
Nonmetropolitan Planning Districts
in Fiscal Year
1974

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS
(Pursuant to Title IX, Section 901
of the Agricultural Act of 1970)

U. S. Department of Agriculture
U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D. C.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House:

We are transmitting herewith the fifth annual report on financial and technical assistance provided by our two Departments in FY 1974 for nonmetropolitan planning districts as authorized by P.L. 90-448. This report is submitted pursuant to Title IX, Section 901(c) of P.L. 91-524.

We trust that you will find this report to be informative and useful.

Sincerely,



EARL L. BUTZ
Secretary of Agriculture



CARLA ANDERSON HILLS
Secretary of Housing and Urban
Development

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary	1
Background	1
HUD Support of Rural Regionalism	2
Programs of Rural Districts	3
Representative Nonmetropolitan Activities	4
USDA Community Development Role	6
State Organization of District Systems	9
Rural Regionalism: Problems and Prospects	12
Changes in HUD Planning Assistance Program	15
 Table 1--Summary of HUD Financial Support for Nonmetropolitan Planning Districts, Fiscal 1969-74	 3
 Table 2--Technical and Educational Services of Department of Agriculture and Cooperating State Agencies in Support of Nonmetropolitan Planning Districts, Fiscal 1974	 8
 Table 3--Progress in Establishing Statewide Systems of Multi- county Planning and Development Districts, as of June 30, 1974	 10
 Appendix I--Summary of Individual State Rural Development Committee Reports	 16
 Appendix II--Summary of Research on Multicounty Planning Organizations	 29
 Appendix III--Comprehensive Planning Assistance Grants to Nonmetropolitan Areawide Planning Agencies, Fiscal 1972-74	 30

April 1975

FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE
DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
FOR NONMETROPOLITAN PLANNING DISTRICTS IN FISCAL YEAR 1974

Summary

In fiscal 1974, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) extended grants totaling \$6.9 million to 44 States for planning programs of 315 nonmetropolitan districts under P.L. 90-448. Through its field staffs and those of associated State agencies, the Department of Agriculture contributed an estimated 502.5 man-years of professional and administrative services in the organization and operation of district programs.

Background

P.L. 90-448, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, authorized the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to States for comprehensive planning programs of nonmetropolitan districts. The Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to provide technical assistance in connection with the establishment of districts and the operation of their programs. A nonmetropolitan district was defined in the Act as all or part of one or more counties and one or more other units of general local government, but not including any portion of a metropolitan area. HUD guidelines further state that a district should normally comprise several counties and cities with related geographic features and common problems and opportunities. In fiscal 1974, HUD grants could not exceed two-thirds of the total cost of the district planning activities for which funds were made available, except for economic development districts and local development districts (Appalachian), which were eligible for grants totaling 75 percent of the cost. Funds for nonmetropolitan districts are generally provided through State planning or other designated State agencies. A list of districts receiving HUD assistance may be found in the Appendix.

HUD Support of Rural Regionalism

The Comprehensive Planning Assistance (701) program has been aiding small towns and rural areas for more than 20 years. HUD's investment in nonmetropolitan America through this activity has been substantial.

The proportion of all 701 funds applied in fiscal 1973 in nonmetropolitan America is estimated to be 26.2 percent, which compares reasonably well with the 27 percent of the population reported by the Bureau of the Census to be residing in nonmetropolitan areas at that time. More than 2,000 different municipalities, counties, and areawide organizations have been assisted since 1972, the first year for which an appropriation of \$100 million was available.

HUD's support for nonmetropolitan regional organizations is related to its commitment to strengthen the decisionmaking and administrative capability of State and local governments. Programs of regional agencies receiving assistance are intended to address problems resulting from the lack of coordinated development of resources and services in rural areas and to facilitate comprehensive planning for rural development on a continuous basis.

Each succeeding fiscal year since the program began in FY 1969 has seen an increase in the number of nonmetropolitan districts assisted. However, the rapid growth in the number of planning districts established by the States as well as a general reduction in the total funds available for all planning assistance grants from HUD in FY 1974 resulted in a decline in the average grant per district. Support for nonmetropolitan districts was limited in FY 1974 because of a 25-percent reduction in the appropriation for HUD planning assistance, compared with the amount for FY 1973 (table 1).

In carrying out the nonmetropolitan planning program, HUD continues to emphasize two principles:

1. Planning is an integral part of government decisionmaking. Thus, programs assisted should be conducted to improve the effectiveness of government administration at all levels.
2. Planning must take into account the overall State and regional dimension of major present-day development issues such as transportation, industrial growth, environmental protection, energy resource management, and land use.

In metropolitan America, the role of regional councils is primarily one of coordinating decisions among large and populous local governments to avoid duplication, inconsistencies, or conflict and to promote economies of scale.

In less densely populated areas, however, regionalism is evolving in response to more basic needs such as:

- * How to secure a greater share of the Nation's financial and technical resources (for example, Federal programs).

Table 1--Summary of HUD financial support for nonmetropolitan planning districts, fiscal 1969-74

Item	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Number of States receiving funds	19	34	34	42	44	44
Number of districts supported	61	131	155	260	277	315
Amount (million dollars)	1.4	2.8	3.4	7.7	8.4	6.9
Average grant (thousand dollars)	22,950	21,374	21,935	29,615	30,032	21,905

* The need to amass enough local expertise and financial resources to initiate programs, rather than to coordinate existing efforts.

* An increasing demand from citizens for better governmental services.

* A desire to make rural areas more attractive for individual growth.

Programs of Rural Districts

HUD grants are passed through States to nonmetropolitan planning districts, where they are used in part for the following purposes:

- *Areawide comprehensive land-use planning.
- *Planning and technical assistance to local governments.
- *Capital improvements programming.
- *Areawide housing studies and programming.
- *Updating overall planning program designs.
- *Regional sewer and water planning.
- *Economic and social base studies and action plans.

Districts receiving HUD assistance are involved in a wide variety of regional improvement and development projects centering on economic, social, and health needs of the community. These include:

- * Designation of new growth centers for development.
- * Inventorying potential sites for new industry.
- * Development of job banks and employment placement services.

- * Promoting technical and vocational training for present workers so they can offer prospective industries either trained workers or trainable workers and training facilities.
- * Involvement in a host of human resource needs--health, law enforcement, nutrition, and housing--to name only a few.

In addition, rural local government officials have found that districts can provide staff backup and expertise unavailable to them at the municipal or county level.

In the human resource field, some nonmetropolitan regional councils serve as the coordinating agency for member local governments; for example, they are:

- * Providing areawide health planning and certification of facility needs.
- * Accomplishing criminal justice and law enforcement planning and coordination.
- * Coordinating activities and funding for programs for the aged and juvenile delinquency.
- * Serving as the areawide vehicle to coordinate a number of public and private agency programs to help people who need human resource services.

Representative Nonmetropolitan Activities

The Department of Housing and Urban Development encourages nonmetropolitan planning organizations to provide planning services that embrace both State and local needs. This is intended to ensure that the district organization will operate a program of comprehensive planning that meets the development needs of local communities and, at the same time, takes into account State and regional planning requirements and objectives.

Following are representative examples of the activities and services carried out during the year by nonmetropolitan districts.

Region Nine Development Commission (Minnesota)--A major threat to the economic livelihood of smaller communities has been the abandonment of rail service for exporting crops. The Commission conducted a feasibility study for collecting and transporting grain more economically out of Minnesota's Region Nine area. A plan for a centralized unit train facility servicing eight grain elevator cooperatives has resulted in an increase in grain production due to increased export capability.

The plan also calls for a centralized grain market and shipping terminal that would bring together the separate cooperatives which are too small to operate economically alone. This plan, when fully implemented, will result in substantial savings and boost the area's economy.

Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development Region (Michigan)--This agency has received 701 funds annually since 1970. The initial effort in 1970 was to qualify member communities as eligible for HUD's water, sewer, and open-space grants through the preparation of comprehensive and functional areawide plans required by HUD and the Environmental Protection Agency. The rapid development of plans and priority setting resulted in member communities receiving \$1.9 million in HUD water and sewer grants during fiscal 1973.

Historically, the State recreation and open-space program had made little impact on nonmetropolitan areas due to their inability to meet State standards. This nonmetropolitan agency was able to meet the stringent planning requirements established by the State of Michigan and thereby qualify member communities as eligible for State recreation and open-space funds.

Another benefit came from a financial analysis which indicated that substantial money could be saved by establishing boards of public works in each county. This saving was possible in that the full faith and credit of the county could be used to back bonds necessary for each project, thereby reducing the interest rates charged. As a result of the agency's recommendation, four of six counties did create boards of public works. On one project alone, it has been estimated that 1 percent interest on a \$1.2 million bond sale was saved for a return to the taxpayers of \$120,000.

Northern Maine Regional Planning Commission--In the 7 years since its creation in 1967, the Northern Maine Regional Planning Commission has established itself as a major organizational resource serving northern Maine. It is recognized for its efforts not only in community and regional planning, but also for economic development, and as the focal point for organizing the resources of the area to deal with problems on a regional basis. It has increased in staff from 2 to 22, and is relied upon by member communities to provide a wide range of technical services.

The Commission has been successful in obtaining economic development assistance to diversify the depressed economy of the region. The foremost example is the formation of the Northern Aroostook Regional Airport Authority and subsequent funding for construction of a regional airport. The Commission also has assisted with applications which funded some 200 jobs through the Emergency Employment Act.

Northwest Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (NWRPC)--As one of its major objectives, NWRPC is directed to foster and enhance economic development in the region. Historically, the region has suffered from a 40-year economic depression as a result of the decline in its natural resource-based economy (timber and iron ore). This area has experienced chronic unemployment (approximately 7 percent annually), a 5-percent decrease in population, and a 166-percent increase in property taxes during the past 10 years.

Utilizing 701 program funds, the NWRPC has addressed these problems through the establishment of an economic development plan for the region as a whole and the potential growth center of Ashland. The plan focuses on three main strategies: develop new employment opportunities at reasonable wages; retain younger members of the population; and diversify Ashland's tax base to achieve more equitable

distribution of taxation. The plan also includes a marketing strategy to recruit industry and to apply for necessary State and Federal funds to assist in this effort.

The region has already realized some positive impacts from the economic development planning effort in that local public official awareness and enthusiasm has increased as the potential for economic vitality has been identified. The implementation of the marketing strategy added to this enthusiasm as an upsurge of new business location inspection trips occurred during the past summer. This effort has brought a psychological lift to the depressed region and is expected to further boost its recovery effort.

Purchase Area Development District (Kentucky)--The district, known as the PADD, is composed of eight counties and was designated as a planning and development district in September 1969. Its primary objectives are to create a more attractive and livable environment and to provide the tools for making the member localities more economically productive.

The PADD has completed districtwide plans for housing, water and sewer, open space, and solid waste management. Governmental jurisdictions at both the regional and local levels are utilizing adopted regional goals and objectives as a framework for implementing a vigorous small community development planning effort.

To further strengthen the small community effort, the PADD has initiated a regional management assistance program. Through the provision of a full-time public administration specialist, retained by the PADD, each community is assisted in such areas as revenue sharing, personnel classification studies, budgets, capital development programs, and feasibility studies. Through this approach, documented savings have been realized in the amount of \$954,850.00.

USDA Community Development Role

State rural development committees (RDC's) are the principal mechanisms by which Department of Agriculture services are coordinated with State and local government and regional planning districts to support substate regional planning and programming. Each State has a committee, which is made up of senior Department of Agriculture and Cooperative Extension Service (CES) officials in each State and generally includes representatives of other Federal and State agencies.

Under the Rural Development Act of 1972, as well as other authorities, the Department of Agriculture now has the broadest community development responsibilities of any Federal department operating in nonmetropolitan areas. These include the administration of loan programs for public works, housing, and business development; educational work at the community level related to planning and development; support of multicounty organizations to improve resource planning and development; provision of basic data and interpretations for land-use planning; agricultural production and marketing programs of all types; forest resource and product development and administration of large forest land areas affecting local communities; loans for public utilities; and others. 1/

1/ See Appendix I for State-by-State description of rural development committees and State and local cooperation in district programming.

The programs of several Department agencies are of particular importance in regional planning and development (table 2):

Soil Conservation Service: SCS assisted State and local officials in organizing regional planning districts in 19 States; made nearly 200 local arrangements to increase cooperation with district agencies; and provided extensive information and technical services in all areas related to soils information and interpretations, water impoundment inventories, and other aspects of land use, environmental improvement, and resource development. Nearly 1,000 members of soil conservation districts, resource conservation and development projects, and watershed governing bodies are serving on the boards of regional planning agencies, and 600 SCS field personnel are on the technical advisory committees. Arrangements have been made in 44 States to coordinate local resource conservation and development project and planning district activities related to natural resources.

Farmers Home Administration: FmHA, whenever possible, has made its administrative districts coterminous with the boundaries of regional planning districts. FmHA district directors have been specifically directed to coordinate with the executive directors of planning districts. This relationship has been particularly important since passage of the Rural Development Act of 1972, which authorized FmHA to make loans for a variety of purposes that would implement regional plans. In addition, FmHA must cooperate closely with regional planning agencies, since most of these have Office of Management and Budget A-95 review responsibilities on projects proposed for funding by FmHA. The agency is presently conducting a field study of its assistance to and cooperation with planning districts to determine how best it can utilize services of the latter in carrying out its housing and community development loan programs.

Forest Service: Through Intergovernmental Personnel Act agreements and other agreements with State foresters, the U.S. Forest Service has placed qualified forest land-use specialists on the staff of State and district planning organizations to assist in natural resource planning. FS and State forestry agencies provide various types of inventory data related to environmental land-use planning. In FY 1974, FS had 18 operating arrangements in 15 States to accelerate forest conservation and development assistance for State planning agencies and nonmetropolitan districts. Approximately \$250,000 in Federal funds matched by \$50,000 State-appropriated funds were utilized for this work in FY 1974.

Economic Research Service: ERS continued to operate an information system for Federal agencies which supplies current data on State progress in establishing districts and performs analytic work related to the subject. In FY 1974, ERS completed a study of regional planning in 10 nonmetropolitan district areas. ^{1/}

Rural Electrification Administration: REA relies heavily on its electric and telephone borrowers (cooperatives and public agencies) to provide assistance for nonmetropolitan planning districts. However, REA supplies information and technical support to borrowers for this purpose. In 1974, about 200 REA borrowers assisted 394 regional planning agencies. The former provided data on

^{1/} See appendix II for summary.

Table 2--Technical and educational services of Department of Agriculture and cooperating State agencies in support of nonmetropolitan planning districts, fiscal 1974

Services provided and agency responsible	Area of service input (in man-years)		
	National	State	Planning district
(Soil Conservation Service) - Technical information and interpretations concerning soil and water resources; assistance in the establishment and operation of regional planning programs	---	52.8	129.7
(Farmers Home Administration) - Information and guidance on housing development, planning of community services, and loan and grant financing for community development; assistance in the organization and operation of regional planning programs	---	12.8	40.3
(Rural Electrification Administration) - Advisory services to electric and telephone borrowers participating in and supporting regional planning programs	---	---	1.0
(Forest Service) - Technical information and guidance, data interpretations, and other planning aids related to forest resources	0.6	12.0	22.0
(Cooperative Extension Service) - Educational assistance to State and local agencies in the organization and implementation of regional planning programs; participation in the operation of such programs, with particular emphasis on community relations, intergovernmental coordination, and plan implementation	0.5	33.8	186.2
(Economic Research Service) - Establishment and operation of an information system and analytical work on district planning by the States and Federal departments	5.5	4.8	---
(Rural Development Service) - Coordination of Federal services with State and local governments	0.5	---	---
Total	7.1	116.2	379.2

electric and telephone needs and services; served on the policy boards of planning districts; assisted in public relations activities; and helped implement projects contained in district development plans.

In addition to the foregoing USDA activities, the Cooperative Extension Services of the State land-grant university systems assisted in the organization of regional planning districts; established educational programs in rural communities concerned with the purpose and potential benefits of regional planning and programming; enabled staffs of regional agencies to rapidly obtain technical and other information from university sources on problems they are attempting to solve; and, in some cases, served on loan as staff members of district agencies. In FY 1974, CES had 375 community resource development agents at work at the field level; a number of them directly assisting regional planning district agencies and in some cases housed in the agency office.

State Organization of District Systems

The majority of planning districts receiving USDA-HUD assistance are now units in State systems of multijurisdictional organizations formed by executive order or statute to conduct regional planning, perform project reviews under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95, and serve other purposes. These regional organizations are evolving into important forces in rural development. By the end of FY 1974, such systems had been announced and delineated for 44 States. A total of 521 regional planning and development districts were included in these State systems, of which 448 were organized and staffed and approximately the same number were being funded from State and local sources in addition to Federal (table 3).

States receiving HUD financial assistance make a determination of which planning organizations locally are to be assisted; therefore, State policy regarding the implementation of a districting program is of critical importance.

The States have moved rapidly in recent years on this front for the specific purpose of improving regional planning, encouraging intergovernmental cooperation, and rationalizing State agency administration at the local level. Of particular importance has been the objective of bringing order out of the chaos of overlapping planning and other programs resulting principally from federally mandated requirements and the formation of special districts, an especially serious matter in nonmetropolitan areas. There are some 1,800 federally encouraged multijurisdictional organizations at the substate level in 19 different functional fields (transportation, health, community development, etc.) under categorical grant programs. There are more than 25,000 special districts and authorities, the fastest growing units of local government; however, only about one-quarter of these have boundaries matching those of local county or city governments. More than 600 regional councils of government have come into being since the early 1960's, more than half of which serve nonmetropolitan areas. Some 450 clearinghouses established to implement OMB Circular A-95 and having review and comment authority have been designated to carry out requirements of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968.

Table 3--Progress in establishing statewide systems of multicounty planning and development districts, as of June 30, 1974

States	Number of districts		
	Officially delineated	With State and/or local financing	Organized and staffed
Alabama	12	12	12
Alaska	0	0	0
Arizona	6	6	6
Arkansas	8	8	8
California	10	4	4
Colorado	13	13	13
Connecticut	15	15	15
Delaware	0	0	0
Florida	10	10	10
Georgia	18	18	18
Hawaii	0	0	0
Idaho	6	6	6
Illinois	5	0	0
Indiana	17	14	14
Iowa	16	11	11
Kansas	11	9	11
Kentucky	15	15	15
Louisiana	8	8	8
Maine	8	8	8
Maryland	7	5	5
Massachusetts	13	13	13
Michigan	14	14	14
Minnesota	13	13	11
Mississippi	10	10	10
Missouri	20	20	20
Montana	12	0	0
Nebraska	26	16	14
Nevada	0	0	0
New Hampshire	6	6	6
New Jersey	10	10	10
New Mexico	6	6	6
New York	11	11	11
North Carolina	17	17	17
North Dakota	8	7	7
Ohio	15	1	1
Oklahoma	11	11	11
Oregon	14	13	13
Pennsylvania	10	8	8
Rhode Island	0	0	0
South Carolina	10	10	10
South Dakota	6	6	6
Tennessee	9	9	9
Texas	21	21	21
Utah	7	7	7

Continued-

Table 3--Progress in establishing statewide systems of multicounty planning and development districts, as of June 30, 1974--Con.

States	Number of districts		
	Officially delineated	With State and/or local financing	Organized and staffed
Vermont	13	13	13
Virginia	22	22	22
Washington	13	4	11
West Virginia	11	11	11
Wisconsin	8	2	2
Wyoming	0	0	0
Total	521	443	448

The States' action to establish "wall-to-wall" systems of planning districts with comprehensive and coordinative responsibilities is endorsed by influential national organizations and commissions that have studied the issue in detail.

In FY 1974, for example, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), following a 2-year study of the subject, recommended policies in three areas: State districting, local government reorganization, and new assignments of governmental functions. ACIR called on the States to provide a statutory framework for the creation of umbrella multijurisdictional organizations in all substate planning regions. The Commission strongly recommended that the Federal Government support these State initiatives. The State-designated umbrella organizations, under local government control, would be responsible for functions now being performed by a variety of local councils of government, regional planning commissions, and other similar quasi-governmental organizations.

The Commission's recommendation followed similar findings of selected public interest groups that late in 1972 informed OMB in a report that all single purpose multijurisdictional areawide programs should be under the control of, or coordinated through, an umbrella organization whose policy board was composed of elected officials of general-purpose units of local government. A working committee of the National Governor's Conference made the same general proposal in 1973.

In its administration of comprehensive planning assistance under P.L. 90-448, HUD has endeavored to encourage the State-initiated moves toward systems of regional planning agencies having the recommended umbrella type of responsibility.

Rural Regionalism: Problems and Prospects

There is a wide variation in the present role of rural regional agencies, their capacity to meet the demands being made upon them, and the support they receive from State as well as local officials. In some States, particularly those in the Southeast, regionalism is a well-advanced concept; in others, the idea on a statewide scale is new and controversial, although strong local area-wide programs involving several jurisdictions may exist. Some rural planning districts have 20 to 30 professionals working at a wide variety of programs, with the energetic support and participation of local elected officials; others may have only two or three employees and lack strong support.

State rural development committees were recently asked to comment on the issue of where rural regionalism stands in 1974, as well as the impact on USDA programs of nonmetropolitan district agencies.

Those committees responding to the inquiry (approximately 60 percent) seem to agree that regional planning agencies do improve the delivery of USDA services to rural communities, principally by performing analytic and technical work related to the long-term needs of these communities and helping educate the officials of small governments to understand better the workings of various programs. Where conflict arises between local administrators of USDA programs and regional agency staffs, the consensus is the problem can be resolved locally without undue trouble.

Several State committees report, however, that in the initial stages of regional program organization there may be misunderstanding on the part of governing board members and staff regarding the proper role of USDA in planning and implementation and of Cooperative Extension Service, which they may expect to act as an "advocate" of specific programs. A few State committees report that some regional planning officials feel they should have authority to direct programs administered by USDA personnel and to involve themselves in implementation of projects the latter may fund. However, this is not considered a serious issue by the rural development committees, in general. They indicate additional operating experience and increased cooperation between the regional agencies and USDA field staffs will satisfactorily resolve the matter.

Of more pertinent concern to the State rural development committees are growing demands being placed upon USDA and Extension field staffs in areas where mature relationships exist as well as where regional planning districts are now going into operation. In the former case, regional directors are increasingly aware of the many technical, educational, and administrative services available through the USDA that can supplement and support their own efforts. They are calling upon Department and Extension personnel locally for extensive assistance in connection with land-use planning, the design and implementation of housing programs, areawide reviews required under OMB Circular A-95, efforts to direct information on planning activities to local leaders and citizens, agriculture-related programs, and others.

Where State and local governments are attempting to establish regional planning and development programs, USDA and CES field staffs are often called upon to serve as staff on an interim basis. In one Midwestern State, for example, resource conservation and development (RC&D) project organizations are serving as the regional planning boards on an interim basis and SCS personnel assigned to these RC&D projects are performing major planning staff functions. Extension personnel, in some instances, have also done the basic survey and community organization work preliminary to the establishment of districts. Thus, increasing demands are being placed on USDA personnel locally at a time when their many responsibilities for support and implementation of agricultural programs are also growing rapidly because of world food demands and farm resource conservation needs. It is the general view of those rural development committees commenting on the issue that Department personnel should be assigned to work with regional planning agencies, whenever possible, where the latter have programs requiring nearly full-time input.

There is some concern that the regional agencies are not staffed adequately to perform the many responsibilities assigned to them as a result of Federal and State programs and to meet the needs of local rural governments, many of which do not have the employees to perform the increasingly complex task of local government administration. For example, in one Midwestern State with regional planning and development agencies in existence in most areas more than 3 years, nonmetropolitan agencies averaged only slightly more than two professional employees. In one of the Great Lake States, the average was roughly the same, with however, several district agencies remaining unorganized. Newly formed districts may have only the services of an executive director and supporting clerical assistance for a geographic area 80 miles or more across.

In addition, approximately two-thirds of the annual funding of regional agencies is still derived from Federal programs, and these programs continue to have categorical requirements directed toward specific functional types of planning; for example, land use, housing, transportation, water quality control, health, law enforcement, programs for the aging, etc. Thus, it is difficult, particularly in new districts, for the regional agency staff to undertake a truly comprehensive program of planning and to establish work program priorities they consider important for their area.

The State rural development committees commenting on the subject generally do not believe local governments participating in the regional planning programs have the capacity or willingness to provide additional financial support, at least in the near future. As one committee put it in its report, "A recommendation that the local contribution be increased for the regional planning agencies would not be received favorably."

The size of regional planning and development districts that have been delineated within State systems does not seem to present a major problem of communication or administration in most States. However, several committees located in the Great Plains and Western areas of the Nation did report that one or more districts within their States were too large to be served by a single staff. In one Great Plains State, for example, one district included 19 counties, which the committee stated was too large for effective regional planning operations. In a Mountain State, physical obstacles to intercounty communication present a formidable problem in local program operations. And in one Pacific Coast State, it has been decided to change from the existing multicounty districts into what is considered a more workable program under which areawide planning will be conducted on a county or multicounty basis at the option of local government officials. These cases, however, seem to be confined to States with particular geographic problems impeding intercounty communication. They are not found generally in the eastern half of the Nation.

The rural development committees generally agree that the issue of land-use planning and long-term programs to effect land use in nonmetropolitan areas is critical at this time. They consider this to be a major responsibility of regional planning agencies and the local governments represented thereon. As one committee puts it, "Land-use planning will need to be looked at as an economic, social, and political problem, as well as a physical problem." The basic dilemma is the need to implement environmental and land-use priorities through the mechanism of local government backed up by citizen support for such action. The committees generally take the position that land use is and must remain primarily a local responsibility. However, they also agree that it will take major new initiatives to educate citizens in nonmetropolitan areas to the need for action and to the acceptance of at least minimal controls. In addition, such USDA agencies as SCS will need more technical personnel to meet the demands of planning agencies and of local governments for resource data and interpretations necessary in planning programs.

Finally, the committees are strongly of the opinion that regional agencies at this time should not attempt to broaden their responsibilities from the present planning, review, and technical assistance into program implementation. The latter should remain the responsibility of local governments. If no other

means can be found to implement a regional action program, the planning agency and the local governments should establish a special district apart from the regional planning agency. It is pointed out by one committee that local governments are apprehensive about losing their power to another layer of government and that there would be strong opposition to the creation of a general-purpose regional government organization. This opinion seems to be nearly universal among the rural development committees commenting.

Changes in HUD Planning Assistance Program

The enactment of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-383) has substantially amended the program of HUD assistance for State and local comprehensive planning. All grant recipients will now carry out an on-going comprehensive planning process, which by August 1977 needs to include a new land-use element. This element must have criteria and implementing procedures for directing major growth decisions as well as a general plan indicating the pattern and intensity of land use. It must also specify local goals, annual objectives, and programs designed to meet these objectives as well as evaluation procedures.

While many of the old patterns will remain, two new factors are expected to distinguish the use of HUD planning assistance funds by the locally based nonmetropolitan organizations responsible for planning and development. These are:

1. An emphasis on pooling talent and resources and the application of areawide governmental mechanisms to save public funds and improve the quality of life in nonmetropolitan America.
2. A growing concern for growth management problems as population trends reverse in selected areas. Regions impacted by new large-scale enterprises seeking energy resources may have especially severe problems. These will range from the need to preserve the environmental conditions previously thought to be impervious to the adverse effects of development to the provision of new and adequate housing for an increased labor force.

SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL STATE RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORTS

State rural development committees (RDC's) ^{1/} consist of senior officials of Federal and State agencies operating programs of critical importance in the development of nonmetropolitan areas of the States. The makeup of each committee is determined by its membership. The chairman is usually a representative of the State Cooperative Extension Service (CES) ^{1/} or a U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) ^{1/} agency.

State RDC's serve to coordinate programs affecting nonmetropolitan areas; to exchange information among agencies; and to provide leadership in the direction of Federal and State efforts to assist rural communities and improve opportunities and living conditions therein. Most State RDC's include a representative of the State agency responsible for providing financial support and technical assistance for nonmetropolitan planning and development districts.

Since the inception of the joint USDA-HUD program in FY 1969, State RDC's have taken the lead in assuring that USDA technical, educational, and, where appropriate, financial assistance has been utilized to support the programs of planning and development districts.

As indicated in the following State-by-State summaries, the committees have adopted a number of different methods of gaining these objectives within the districts. Among the most important is the formation of regional rural development committees of middle-management USDA and CES officials in an area to work with the technical staffs and governing boards of districts on a continuing basis.

Districtwide planning and other programs are usually conducted by an official agency consisting of a technical staff and governing board of local elected officials, although some regional district agencies may include nonelected local leaders. Regional organizations often were in existence in the form of councils of government, regional planning commissions, economic development districts, and others prior to establishment of a border-to-border system of districts by State government. Following State delineation of district boundaries, they became the multijurisdictional agency for their area, with responsibility for a variety of programs.

Work programs of regional districts may vary somewhat from State to State and even among districts within a State. However, they usually have as their core the following: preparing regional development plans; providing technical assistance to member governments in planning and management; performing reviews of applications for Federal assistance submitted by local jurisdictions (OMB Circular A-95); satisfying requirements of a variety of Federal programs for regional plan preparation; and assigning local officials and others to obtain

^{1/} These abbreviations are used throughout this section.

Federal services and financial assistance. District boundaries may also be utilized by State agencies to delineate administrative areas for their programs.

Following is a summary of reports on State progress in establishing district programs and participation therein by USDA and CES, as submitted by the State RDC's for FY 1974.

ALABAMA -- In 1971, an executive order established 12 regional planning and development districts, all of which have been organized. The director of the State Development Office is a member of the State RDC. This provides an opportunity for USDA agencies to learn of planning district programs and needs. The RDC emphasizes the work of the districts and encourages their use in coordination, planning, and project development. Joint training meetings of USDA field and planning district personnel have been effective in promoting the exchange of information among participants. Planning district staff members generally attend meetings of county rural development committees. A wide range of USDA assistance is available to the staffs of planning districts. CES and the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) have established geographic areas for Extension community resource development specialists and SCS area conservationists that are approximately the same as the districts and these area agents are responsible for working with the districts. Resource conservation and development (RC&D) project boards also have established relationships with the districts. Regional district agencies provide information and data concerning the regions they serve that is useful to USDA field personnel and county RDC's in the operation of their programs. Of particular importance is a procedure through which the State RDC comments on annual work programs of the regions and recommends methods of carrying these to fruition. Also, USDA field offices and CES have developed joint programs with district planners for land-use planning and education.

ALASKA -- Planning in this State is conducted on a municipal or borough basis. There is one planning district-type organization serving a metropolitan area. Four regional RDC's have been formed to assist in locally based planning and development programs, to improve intergovernmental relations, and increase participation of citizen leaders in local programs. The major achievement of the State RDC in FY 1974 was an agricultural potential study, identifying acreage suitable for commercial agriculture within the local regions. The committee also initiated a forum to discuss the development of Statewide planning goals and objectives.

ARIZONA -- An executive order in 1970 established six regional planning districts for the State, all of which are now organized with a governing board and staff. USDA and CES services are being utilized extensively in connection with activities of the districts, particularly regional planning and coordination of intergovernmental programs.

ARKANSAS -- A law passed in 1969 authorized the State Planning Commission to designate planning and development districts, and eight existing economic development districts were recognized as basic units in the State system. Governing boards of the districts include nonelected officials, as well as local government representatives. The State agency responsible for providing assistance to districts is represented on the RDC. CES has a community resource development agent working in each district, who is an ex officio member of the district board.

Whenever possible, at the local level, USDA and CES operate in close conjunction with the districts and attempt to utilize priorities of the latter in their program planning.

CALIFORNIA -- The State Council on Intergovernmental Relations delineated nine planning district areas in 1970, with an additional district being created in 1971. Although not all of these districts have been staffed or funded, there are an extensive number of intergovernmental planning organizations in the State. At least 16 of these serve principally nonmetropolitan areas and have project notification and review responsibilities under OMB Circular A-95. USDA agencies assist extensively in the programs of these organizations.

COLORADO -- Thirteen planning and management districts were created by an executive order dated November 30, 1973, under the State's Planning Act of 1967. Agencies have been organized in all of the regions. Regional RDC's are coterminous with the districts. Three CES community resource development agents work closely with the districts. Until such time as additional agents are employed, county Extension directors have been assigned a liaison role with the districts. In one region, a U.S. Forest Service employee is assigned to work directly with the district staff. The State RDC participates in project reviews, cosponsors workshops and leadership training, and promotes increased coordination of USDA and CES programs at the local level with planning district goals and objectives.

CONNECTICUT -- County governments were abolished in 1958. Fifteen regional planning agencies were created by statute. Representatives of State agencies assisting the regional agencies are members of the RDC. CES was actively involved in the educational program that helped establish planning districts. In addition, there are numerous other examples of cooperation between the regional planning agencies and the USDA and CES. These include jointly sponsored conferences to discuss the needs and problems of substate areas. As appropriate, State RDC members attend the meetings of the regional planning directors. There is also considerable exchange of information among agencies participating in the regional programs and cooperation in preparing documents (such as soil reports) required for land-use and environmental planning. The regional agencies are of particular importance because they are able to mobilize public opinion on controversial issues related to long-term development.

DELAWARE -- There are no official substate planning districts in the State; however, individual counties and municipalities conduct planning programs and the State's major metropolitan area has an interstate areawide agency; there is an economic development district serving an interstate area and an RC&D project area for the State. USDA and CES services are used extensively by local planners, particularly relating to land use, housing, community facilities, agriculture and natural resources, and community education.

FLORIDA -- The Comprehensive Planning Act of 1972 authorized creation of regional planning districts, ten of which have been established. The governing boards include citizen leaders as well as elected officials. USDA and CES agencies are represented on nonmetropolitan planning district boards and are participating extensively in preliminary planning leading to the organization of programs.

GEORGIA -- Legislation authorizing intercounty planning and programming was adopted in the 1960's and strengthened in 1970. Districts were first organized in 1968 and were certified by an executive order in 1971, which established 18 regional units called Area Planning and Development Commissions (APDC's). The State RDC includes representatives of State agencies responsible for assistance to the commissions. CES administrative districts have been restructuring to conform with APDC boundaries and in FY 1974, three CES community resource development agents were assigned to three APDC's. County CES agents are chairmen of two APDC's. In addition, approximately 12 Extension agents are serving on other commission boards. USDA agencies also are participating extensively in the APDC programs. They provide advice and counsel regarding Federal financial and technical assistance available, participate in land-use planning projects of the APDC's, serve on technical and other boards and committees, and are utilized for special projects, for example, forest industry product development. The APDC's in the State are a principal means by which local USDA employees determine priority needs and long-term development goals of local areas and can target their own services toward realizing these goals.

HAWAII -- The State Department of Planning and Economic Development provides central planning services and economic development research for Hawaii's four counties, which are basically the four principal islands. The counties also have long-standing areawide planning programs that are assisted in all aspects by USDA and CES local personnel.

IDAHO -- An executive order in 1972 established six substate regional planning districts. Councils of government have been formed as the planning and development agencies for five of the six regions. The State RDC cooperates closely with the State agency responsible for strengthening regional programming. The principal contributions of USDA and CES are community educational work locally; statistical, research, and land-use studies related to defining regional configurations, and realignment of administrative districts to correspond with the regions. USDA middle-management committees have been established for each of the regions. The chief of the State Bureau of Planning and Community Affairs is a member of the RDC. This serves to coordinate USDA programs having special importance in regional planning and development. USDA and CES also assist in regional agency administration, preparation of plans, economic development activities, regional housing proposals, and project reviews. SCS has assigned two technicians under the U.S. Intergovernmental Personnel Act to assist in developing a Statewide land-use plan. CES assisted in the plan and followup public affairs educational work. U.S. Higher Education Act funds have been used by CES to provide a community resource development agent on a full-time basis to help with one planning district program.

ILLINOIS -- In 1971, an executive order was issued creating five major planning and development district areas, initially for State administrative purposes. The second stage of the program, i.e., establishment of seven areas for regional planning purposes, has not been implemented, although there are numerous multi-county and single-county planning units active in the State under the auspices of local governments. CES and USDA field personnel assist these agencies on request and county RDC's may be represented on them.

INDIANA -- An executive order was issued in 1968 establishing 17 substate regions for planning purposes. Agencies have not been organized for most of these areas until recently.

IOWA -- An executive order in 1968 created 16 regional districts, principally for State agency administrative purposes. In FY 1974, an effort was begun to form planning organizations for these regions and 11 now have professional staffs. In FY 1974, the State RDC organized areawide RDC's for three of the regions and is discussing formation of additional such units. The State RDC includes a representative of the State agency responsible for organizing and assisting the districts. An example of assistance provided by USDA and CES personnel in FY 1974 is in a southwestern district, where an analysis was made of water system needs, a water district was organized, community educational programs were undertaken to inform local citizens of the district organization and purpose, and consultation was provided in connection with engineering studies and funding of projects. As State and local officials move forward with the district program, it is expected that USDA and CES will be called upon extensively for similar contributions.

KANSAS -- An executive order in 1971 established the basis for regional planning in the State. There are now 13 regional planning commissions in operation, two of which are interstate. Most have at least minimal staffs. To coordinate more closely with the planning regions, the State RDC has established areawide RDC's for each of the regions, made up principally of USDA and CES personnel. The principal aim of the State RDC is to encourage coordination of USDA programs on a regional basis using the regional RDC cooperating with the planning district staffs. USDA and CES State personnel have assisted State officials in organizing district planning agencies. However, the district agencies are still in the formative stage and have only recently acquired executive officers in many cases. Of particular importance in FY 1974 has been the work of CES in informing local officials and citizens of the purpose and structure of planning regions. Extension community resource development agents have been particularly important in this regard. SCS personnel serving with RC&D projects also are assisting in the initial stages of regional agency development. Some positive improvement in delivery of USDA services has resulted from regional agency operations since the latter provided a vehicle for determining areawide priorities and putting together projects of regional concern.

KENTUCKY -- Fifteen area development districts were formed under an executive order in 1967 and the concept was given a legislative basis in 1972. CES has adjusted its area boundaries to follow district lines. RC&D projects established in recent years coincide with the area development district boundaries. Working relationships between USDA field staffs and area development districts are well established and foster close cooperation between the two groups. The executive director of the State's Local Government Office is a member of the State RDC and provides continuing information on district programs. Within the district area, planning staffs provide USDA field personnel and area RDC's with continuing information on their plans and program needs. USDA and CES have participated in the development of community service and other major projects sponsored by the area districts and local governments. A major result of the area district programs has been increased interest and concern on the part of local government officials in land-use planning problems and issues, particularly as these relate to health, environmental, and quality of life in the rural communities.

LOUISIANA -- An executive order in 1973 formally established eight State planning districts, some of which were in existence previously as areawide planning or development agencies. The State RDC works closely with the State agency responsible for the program. The RDC reviews overall program designs of the nonmetropolitan districts, and the parish RDC's have a formal liaison arrangement with district agencies. Technical assistance on a wide variety of areawide problems and issues, such as solid waste disposal, land-use planning and zoning, subdivision surveys, construction of sewer and water facilities, housing, and agricultural development, is being provided by USDA agencies. Periodic meetings of the State RDC are held on a rotating basis in the principal cities, which are headquarters for planning districts.

MAINE -- An executive order in 1972 established eight planning and development districts for the State. Eleven regional planning commissions are in operation within these districts. The director of the State planning office is a member of the State RDC and his agency has close working relationships with RDC agency representatives. Principal projects of planning districts include housing studies, regional land use, planning for local jurisdictions, solid waste disposal programming, and studies leading to lake quality and transportation improvement. USDA and CES personnel are participating in all of these. The boundaries of two RC&D project areas were changed to conform with the State-designated districts.

MARYLAND -- The State Department of Planning has proposed a system of seven sub-state regions for planning purposes. Five of these now have regional planning organizations. The State RDC (termed Rural Affairs Council) reviews overall program designs for planning districts prior to submission to HUD. This enables the Council, as well as county rural development groups, to have an opportunity to make suggestions on the individual proposals as well as to plan their own programs in line with areawide priorities. The chief State planner is a member of the RDC and serves as chairman of that organization's long-range planning committee. A RC&D project area board and the regional planning district for the same geographic area cooperate on a continuing basis on joint programs and activities. The district agency is one of the sponsoring agencies for the RC&D project. The principal concern of the State RDC is improved land-use planning and a priority area of concentration is working with regional agencies in this field.

MASSACHUSETTS -- Various statutes authorize the establishment of regional planning districts, of which there are now 13 of the official State system. RDC's have been formed for each of the district regions and planning directors of the latter are generally represented on the committee. USDA and CES field staffs are active in district programs requiring technical, educational, or financial assistance for which they are responsible.

MICHIGAN -- Executive orders in 1968, 1970, and 1973 established the basis for a 14-district program of substate regional planning districts, all of which are organized and staffed. The State RDC has established one regional RDC, on a pilot basis, to test the coordination of USDA and related programs with district needs and activities. The State committee also plans to initiate review and comment on the annual plans of work of the regions. RC&D project boards are developing memorandums of understanding with the districts to assure continuing

coordination. District planning agencies have planned community services and other projects, then assisted communities concerned to obtain financial backing from various Federal agencies, including USDA, and monitored the construction and followup management process for the projects.

MINNESOTA -- Enabling legislation was enacted in 1969 authorizing the establishment of a substate regional planning program. Thirteen districts have been designated, of which 11 have at least a rudimentary staff. The State RDC coordinates USDA programs with the districts through regional RDC's. In addition, representatives of the State agency responsible for program support meet, as necessary, with the State RDC. CES community resource development agents have the responsibility of coordination with the regional development commissions. Since the State enabling statute gives local governments considerable control over regional program implementation, progress being made in specific areas shows great variation.

MISSISSIPPI -- An executive order in 1971 established a system of substate planning and development districts and there are now ten such districts. A representative of the State government concerned with district program activities is a member of the State RDC. The director of the State Research and Development Center, which is responsible for planning assistance to district agencies, is a member of the State RDC. USDA and CES agencies in FY 1974 participated in the following regional program activities: development of training programs for workers with the aging; housing studies and projects; countywide sewer and water planning; soil information and interpretations; watershed development and erosion control; recreation inventories; and solid waste management. In FY 1974, the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) altered its administrative districts to bring them into line with the regional planning agency areas and FmHA district directors were charged with responsibility for coordination with regional agency staffs. RC&D project areas also are coterminous. Several CES community resource development agents are assigned to planning district areas.

MISSOURI -- Legislation passed in 1966 authorized local governments to form regional planning commissions. By 1970, 20 such commissions had been established through local resolution and executive order. The State planning agency has a representative on the RDC who keeps the members informed of State and regional planning activities. In FY 1974, CES exchanged a memorandum of understanding with seven of the planning districts as a basis for future joint activities, particularly in the community educational field. District staffs assist USDA field personnel in a variety of ways: They provide a one-stop service for information to local governments, a means of focusing attention on critical problems which can be alleviated in part by USDA services, and a clearinghouse that relates project applications to areawide needs.

MONTANA -- An executive order was issued in 1971 establishing 12 districts for planning and administrative purposes. Most of these are now in the initial stage of formation and program development.

NEBRASKA -- An executive order issued in 1969 established 26 planning and development district areas. However, a number of these are not yet organized. Twenty-six RDC's at the local level are organized for the geographic boundaries of the State-designated districts. Representatives of the State office

responsible for regional planning and program support meet regularly with the State RDC and the former submitted its annual program of work in FY 1974 to the committee for comment. Particular emphasis has been placed on assistance from USDA and CES agencies in long-term land-use planning. In addition, in one western district the SCS coordinator for the RC&D project and a CES person assigned to the area have made the principal staff contribution to district formation.

NEVADA -- One nonmetropolitan district area consisting of five counties has been designated; in addition, there are two metropolitan regional planning areas, as well as a bi-State compact planning agency for the Lake Tahoe Basin. The non-metropolitan planning group cosponsored the application for a RC&D project and implementing programs of the U.S. Economic Development Administration. A delineation of other areas in the State for establishment of districts is being discussed for the principal purpose of coordinating intergovernmental activities.

NEW HAMPSHIRE -- An executive order in 1972 reorganized the State system into six planning region districts, each of which is organized with a governing board and staff. USDA and CES members of the State Resources Executive Committee are collaborating with the governor's office and the Office of Comprehensive Planning to assure support for and participation in the regional planning programs. Planning districts are an important mechanism for the delivery of USDA services to local people and communities. The director of State planning and the RDC chairman have established a system of exchanging information on funding and other issues related to the regional programs. Among the principal areas of emphasis for the latter are land-use planning, technical assistance to local governments, provision of areawide water and sewer systems, controls related to land use, housing, and the environment. USDA's Soil Conservation Service is providing technical information in connection with the land-use studies.

NEW JERSEY -- An executive order in 1972 established ten substate regional areas for State planning and administrative purposes and to meet Federal requirements relating to areawide coordination. However, the State has numerous metropolitan areas, many of which are interstate in character, and these participate in regional organizations of various types. USDA and CES agencies contribute services, particularly in community education and land-use planning, to these local intergovernmental planning agencies.

NEW MEXICO -- An executive order in 1973 established seven regional planning and development districts and governing boards. Each has been organized. The State agency responsible for assistance to the regional planning districts is represented on the State RDC and coordinators for the seven regions work closely with the RDC to assure adequate USDA and CES backup. USDA and CES field personnel have a continuing working relationship with the regional agencies and provide appropriate assistance in the various phases of regional planning and development programs.

NEW YORK -- An executive order in 1971 designated 11 planning and development regions, all of which are served by planning agencies. The State RDC has used the same regional delineations for organizing regional RDC operations. Also, the regional planning directors are members of the regional RDC's. In several counties and regions, CES agents serve on county and regional planning boards,

and other USDA county personnel serve on technical subcommittees of planning agencies. Principal projects of regional planning districts include housing studies, regional land-use inventory and analysis, technical assistance for local governments in land-use planning, recreational and natural resources analyses, and development of regional goals.

NORTH CAROLINA -- General legislation was enacted in 1969 to encourage the formation of substate planning regions and 17 of these were delineated in a 1970 executive order. Planning agencies for all of these have been formed. In FY 1974, the State RDC took the following actions to strengthen USDA and CES support for the regional planning district programs: named the representative of the regional agencies to the committee; increased the representation of regional agencies on county RDC's; realigned administrative districts of CES and SCS to coincide with the regions and named middle-management officials to serve as liaison with the regional planning agencies. There is close cooperation between the two State agencies responsible for technical and financial assistance for regional and local planning and the members of the RDC. This provides for direct involvement of both groups in problems, programs, and other issues related to the development of the smaller communities in the State. Assistance provided by USDA and CES agencies in FY 1974 included educational programs, financing of projects being planned by the regional agencies, technical assistance and land-use planning and community facilities development, and studies related to health, educational, and welfare matters. A CES community resource development agent was assigned to one region to support the areawide program.

NORTH DAKOTA -- Eight planning and development districts were created by an executive order in September 1969, seven of which are organized. The director of the State Planning Division is represented on the RDC. CES has assigned development specialists on a district basis and proposed RC&D project areas are in conformance with district boundaries. To avoid duplication, district and RC&D governing boards are one and the same. In a few instances, RC&D coordinators are serving as district staff directors on an interim basis. Districts are useful in improving the delivery of USDA and cooperating State agency services. Examples are RC&D and planning district collaboration, regionalization of Extension community resource and development programs, and joint Forest Service-district land-use studies. The State RDC has endorsed proposed legislation which would permit State and increased local funding of planning districts.

OHIO -- During FY 1974, the governor issued an executive order to establish a substate districting program encompassing the entire State. Fifteen planning districts have been delineated and are now in the process of formation. CES and USDA representatives participated in discussions leading to the issuance of the executive order and the implementation of the program. It is expected they will have a major role at the State and local level as the districts are formed and go into operation.

OKLAHOMA -- Eleven planning and development districts were established through an executive order in 1971. Agencies have been formed for each of the districts and in FY 1974 they made increasing use of USDA and CES services in programming regional improvements, conducting land-use programs, and increasing citizen involvement and support.

OREGON -- Fourteen State administrative districts were created by executive order in 1968, as amended in 1970, and councils of government have been organized for each of the administrative districts. The districts are principally for the use of State agencies in administration of the latter's programs. The State RDC has taken major steps to coordinate USDA and Extension programs: A RDC was formed for each of the 14 administrative districts; the State agency administering the districting program is represented on the RDC; regional RDC's provide technical and information services for regional planning; staff members of regional planning agencies are on the regional RDC's. In the more isolated and rural districts of the State, RDC's are performing administrative and planning services for the district on an interim basis until such time as local officials decide to form an areawide agency. In other areas, the regional agency relies heavily upon USDA programs and services for planning and implementation. Five CES community resource development agents are at work on an areawide basis in the State. They assist in regional programs of councils of government and planning districts.

PENNSYLVANIA -- In 1972, an executive order was issued consolidating various types of State-designated regions established for planning and study purposes into a system of ten districts. Seven of these are local development districts under the Appalachian Regional Commission program. CES and SCS have realigned administrative areas to conform with the State-designated districts. RDC's have been organized for four of these and the district planning director is a member of each. In addition, SCS has two U.S. Intergovernmental Personnel Act agreements with district agencies under which SCS technicians are made available to work on district programs. The State agency responsible for planning administration is represented on the RDC and solicits the views of the latter in connection with district funding and other matters. USDA representatives participated in plans and studies of several districts and the preparation of subdivision regulations and measures to control erosion and sediment. District staffs assisted local officials in applying for water and sewer construction loans from USDA (FmHA). In one district, the areawide RDC, as well as the RC&D organization, are collaborating with the planning agency on a regional land-use policy education program.

RHODE ISLAND -- Agencies of the State government are responsible for planning activities on a Statewide basis, and a representative of the State department concerned serves on the State RDC (termed Community Development Committee).

SOUTH CAROLINA -- Ten planning and development districts were established under State enabling legislation in 1971. All districts are organized. An areawide RDC has been established for each district, the executive director of which serves on the former. In addition, a representative of the district serves as an advisory member of the State RDC. The State agency responsible for planning assistance administration solicits the views of the RDC prior to requesting funds from HUD for districts. In FY 1974, USDA and cooperating State agencies participated with the districts in upgrading comprehensive land-use plans for their areas. CES has assigned community resource development agents to the districts, with the major responsibility of explaining planning concepts and objectives to local leaders within the area and obtaining the latter's views and opinions.

SOUTH DAKOTA -- Six planning and development districts were created by executive order in 1970, all of which are now organized. A RDC has been formed for each of the districts for the specific purpose of coordinating USDA field activities with the work of the district staffs. In addition, USDA administrative areas have been realigned to conform with district boundaries. Among the principal programs of district agencies are industrial site development, environmental improvement, water and sewer system construction, improvement of public safety, recreational area development and expansion of health care facilities and services. There is close collaboration between planning district staffs and members of district and county RDC's. USDA (FmHA) personnel met with representatives of the districts and the State in a special session to discuss implementation of the Rural Development Act of 1972. The two groups also have been cooperating to speed up and refine the OMB A-95 review processes. CES has sponsored and participated in a number of public meetings to acquaint community leaders with district concepts. SCS prepared interpretations of engineering properties of soils for ten counties comprising one of the districts. These data are being used in land-use planning and other development activities. SCS also is participating in a large-scale project in a district to rehabilitate small prairie lakes which have been heavily polluted. CES community resource development agents are utilizing the districts as a framework for much of their activity, particularly involving planning and zoning issues confronting communities. Currently, CES, the State Planning Bureau, and planning district officials are conducting a study of State statutes to recommend changes that would improve district programming.

TENNESSEE -- An executive order in 1968 established nine planning and development regional districts for the State. A subsection ordered in 1971 required each State department to take steps to bring its programs into conformance with the designated regions. A representative of the State Planning Office is a member of the RDC and CES requires that its middle management personnel act as liaison to district staffs. RDC's are formed for nine of the districts. These include representatives of the district planning agency. During FY 1974, ten meetings were held throughout the State to develop teamwork between district staffs and CES. USDA agencies have also contributed substantially to planning and development work being undertaken by the districts, which look to USDA agencies for technical assistance and guidance in the latter's fields of responsibility.

TEXAS -- An executive order in 1968 established 21 planning regions. At the present time, 24 councils of government are functioning in the regions to coordinate local planning and development activities affecting communities therein. A representative of the State agency that assists the council agencies is a member of the State RDC. The council of government regions are generally based on a metropolitan core and the surrounding rural communities related to them. CES and USDA personnel locally contribute technical and educational services to council planning staffs and assist in project reviews.

UTAH -- An executive order in 1972 reorganized planning and development districts into seven areas. Each of the seven districts has an organization, which is being assisted by CES and USDA personnel in the area. The State Department of Community Affairs is represented on the RDC, to coordinate the regional programs with RDC agency plans and priorities.

VERMONT -- Legislation adopted in 1967 authorizes creation of regional planning commissions and the State is entirely organized into 13 commission areas. All are presently staffed and have governing boards composed of town representatives. However, some consolidation and reduction of commissions is expected. Administration of the State's new Environmental Control Act is a principal responsibility of the commissions. The State RDC includes representatives of the agencies responsible for planning and community affairs, and area RDC's are linked to the regional commissions. Programs assisted by USDA and CES during FY 1974 include the preparation of land-use maps, participation of natural resource technical teams in commission programs, and various public education and information roles.

VIRGINIA -- The State Planning and Development Act of 1967 authorizes creation of 22 regional planning commissions, all of which have now been formed and are in operation. State agencies have been requested to restructure their administrative districts to conform with planning region boundaries. The State RDC has worked in close collaboration with the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs in all stages of the development of regional programs. Numerous steps have been taken to bring USDA field services and programs into support of planning districts, including district staff participation in preparation of USDA agency plans of work; joint committee memberships, and joint participation in special projects, including land-use planning, housing, job opportunities, and community services. SCS soils information has been computerized for use in regional planning land-use programs. CES community resource development agents are working extensively with the districts to improve community understanding of regional planning and programming concepts, as well as other issues related to area development. SCS has assigned personnel as liaison to planning district agencies. This agency provides basic data for use in the land-use planning programs. FmHA is utilizing planning district services to set areawide priorities and review applications.

WASHINGTON -- In 1969, an executive order was issued establishing 13 planning and development districts. Some revision in the number is now being considered. The existing 13 regional areas do not have comprehensive programs and are not widely used by local government. Under the proposed revision, the State Office of Community Development has devised a new set of policies to reflect the objective of strong countywide and multicounty planning and primary participation of local governments. The latter will be encouraged to establish an areawide district best suited to their needs. The State Office of Community Development is represented on the RDC, and the field staff of this agency are members of three regional RDC middle-management committees. Numerous interjurisdictional programs are in existence such as councils of government, economic development districts, and RC&D project areas. USDA and CES services are an important factor in the operation of these areawide agency programs.

WEST VIRGINIA -- A law was enacted in 1971 authorizing the creation of planning and development districts. In 1972, 11 regions were delineated, all of which now have organized agencies and programs. State officials responsible for program assistance also are members of the State RDC (termed Mountaineers for Rural Progress). Staff members of districts serve on county RDC's. Pending actions of the State planning agency are made an agenda item for the State RDC meetings. USDA and CES field staffs are participating in a variety of district projects,

particularly as these relate to USDA programs and community educational work. Most State agencies and areawide organizations funded by the Federal Government are moving to realign their administrative districts or area of jurisdiction to conform with the boundaries of regional planning districts.

WISCONSIN -- Nine regional planning commission areas were established beginning in 1970. Each of the districts has a functioning agency. Staff members of district agencies participate in programs of regional and county RDC's. The State RDC includes representatives of the agencies responsible for State assistance in the program. USDA and CES, directly and through the county RDC's, are making a major contribution in most phases of regional agency planning and programming. CES is utilized in survey and community educational work related to planning and future land-use policies. SCS and FmHA also are active participants in projects related to their scope of work.

WYOMING -- The State does not at present have a regional planning and development system, although individual multicounty organizations are active in certain areas. Of particular importance in the State are RC&D projects, of which four are authorized. Because of the State's sparse population, it has been determined that development planning and project reviews need to go forward at this time on a statewide basis. Through the State RDC and direct agency contacts, USDA and CES services are channeled into the solution of particular local problems considered of priority by State officials in the statewide program. An example of this is the rehabilitation of the dairy industry in one area where a local processing plant was in serious difficulty and the operations of local milk producers had deteriorated seriously. Three USDA agencies (SCS, FmHA, and ASCS) contributed to the project, as did CES.

APPENDIX II

Multicounty planning organizations can have an important role in the development of nonmetropolitan areas, as shown by a study of ten such entities in six States.

About 100 Federal programs provide cost-share funds for development projects. Each has its own guidelines and administrative procedures that applicants must follow. Large metropolitan areas usually have funds, staff, and professional resources to enable them to identify and participate in these programs. Nonmetropolitan areas generally lack these resources, and hence they may fail to get their share of Federal funding. Regional planning districts can supply the necessary resources, and they also provide a viable base on which development projects can operate.

Policymakers and planners need to know what organizations are active in their areas, and the limitations and scope of these entities, if they are to take full advantage of the services offered. This study provides some insight into the various types of organizations, and their functions and services.

The main functions of these regional organizations are planning, clearinghouse responsibilities, and technical assistance. None of them can tax, adopt land-use regulations, enact zoning regulations, or incur bonded indebtedness. Operating funds usually come from Federal, State, and local sources.

Clearinghouse procedures are required by the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, before that office will consider application for Federal funds provided by the various development programs. Project proposals must clear through State, regional, and local agencies in order to avoid duplication of effort, permit other agencies to raise questions or objectives, and assure that maximum benefits are realized from expenditure of public lands.

Nine of the entities studied are recognized as official State regional planning organizations; eight have clearinghouse responsibilities; seven have been designated by the U.S. Economic Development Administration as economic development districts. Only two, organized specifically for Federal resource conservation and development projects, are concerned with soil and water conservation. One of these has State recognition as a regional planning organization. The other does not.

All ten organizations provide some information and assistance to nonmember agencies as time and expertise permit.

This material was prepared by the Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

APPENDIX III

Data by State, agency, and jurisdiction by county on comprehensive planning assistance grants to nonmetropolitan areawide planning agencies, FY 1972-74, follow on the next page.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE ALABAMA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
North Central Alabama Regional COG	Morgan, Lawrence, Cullman	\$ ---	\$ 30,000	\$ 40,000
Alabama-Tombigbee Rivers Regional Planning and Development Commission	Perry, Marengo, Dallas, Choctaw, Wilcox, Washington, Monroe, Conecuh, Clarke, Sumter	55,300	50,625	50,000
Southeast Alabama RP&DC	Barbour, Covington, Coffee, Dale Henry, Geneva, Houston	68,800	56,750	50,000
South Central Alabama RP&DC	Lowndes, Butler, Crenshaw, Pike, Bullock, Macon	34,900	45,000	44,997
Technical Assistance to Non-metro Agencies		<u>\$159,000</u>	<u>\$200,076</u>	<u>\$184,997</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA-WIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE ALASKA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Fairbanks North Star Borough	NA	\$ 17,000	\$ 12,500	\$ ---
City and Borough of Juneau	NA	21,000	15,000	10,000
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	NA	20,000	---	9,000
Matanuska-Susitna Borough	NA	22,000	---	17,500
City and Borough of Sitka	NA	---	24,000	8,000
North Slope Borough	NA	---	9,000	8,250
Bristol Bay Borough	NA	---	6,000	4,000
Kodiak Island Borough	NA	---	15,000	---
		<u>\$ 80,000</u>	<u>\$ 81,500</u>	<u>\$ 56,750</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE ARIZONA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Northern Arizona COG	Yavapai, Coconino, Navajo, Apache	\$ 7,692	\$ 15,000	\$ 11,250
Central Arizona Association of Governments	Pinal, Gila	7,500	15,000	11,250
Southeastern Arizona Govern- ment Organization	Santa Cruz, Cochise, Graham, Greenlee	7,500	15,000	11,250
District 4 COG	Yuma, Mohave	7,500	15,000	11,250
		<u>\$ 30,192</u>	<u>\$ 60,000</u>	<u>\$ 45,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE ARKANSAS (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Central Ark, Planning and Development District (PDD)	Faulkner, Lonoke, Prairie, Monroe, Pulaski and Saline	\$ 23,649	\$ 18,744	\$ 14,908
West Central Ark, PDD	Johnson, Pope, Conway, Yell, Perry, Montgomery, Garland, Pike, Clark, Hot Spring	38,499	30,930	24,460
Western Ark, PDD	Franklin, Logan, Scott, Polk, Crawford, Sebastian	25,824	18,087	14,377
SW Arkansas PDD	Sevier, Howard, Little River, Hempstead, Nevada, Ouachita, Dallas, Calhoun, Lafayette, Columbia, Union, Miller	38,499	30,930	24,462
SE Arkansas PDD	Grant, Arkansas, Cleveland, Lincoln, Desha, Bradley, Drew, Chicot, Ashley, Jefferson	32,724	25,971	20,385
Eastern Arkansas PDD	Randolph, Clay, Lawrence, Greene, Craighead, Mississippi, Poinsett, Cross, St. Francis, Lee, Phillips, Crittenden	56,649	45,024	35,608
White River PDD	Fulton, Izard, Sharp, Stone, Independence, Jackson, Van Buren, Cleburne, White, Woodruff	36,952	29,256	23,137

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE ARKANSAS (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
NW Arkansas, PDD	Baxter, Searcy, Madison, Carroll, Boone, Newton, Marion, Benton, Washington	\$ 25,304	\$ 20,058	\$ 15,863
		<u>\$278,000</u>	<u>\$219,000</u>	<u>\$173,200</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE CALIFORNIA (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Butte County Association of Governments (CAG)	Butte	\$ 6,000	\$ ---	\$ ---
Merced CAG	Merced	22,750	20,000	20,000
Tahoe Regional Planning Association	Nevada: Douglas (part), Washoe (part), Carson City (part)	---	75,000	55,000
Tulare CAG & King County Regional Planning Association	California: Placer (part), El Dorado (part) Tulare County, King County	40,000	25,000	40,000
San Luis Obispo CAG	San Luis Obispo	---	---	---
North Coast Humboldt CAG	Humboldt, Del Norte, Lake, Mendocino	39,000	---	---
Plumas and Sierra CAG	Plumas, Sierra	20,000	---	---
Central Sierra Planning Council	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras and Tuolumne	---	20,000	20,000

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE CALIFORNIA (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Tri-County Planning Council Inyo-Mono Association of Government Entities	Glenn, Colusa, Tehama Inyo, Mono	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
		---	20,000	20,000
		<u>\$147,750</u>	<u>\$180,000</u>	<u>\$175,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE COLORADO (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
North East Council of Governments	Logan, Sedgwick, Phillips, Morgan, Washington, Yuma		\$ 30,748	\$ 10,000
Larimer-Weld Regional Plan- ning Commission	Larimer, Weld		51,271	10,000
District V	Elbert, Lincoln, Kit Carson, Cheyenne		29,333	6,000
Lower Arkansas Valley COG	Crowley, Kiowa, Bent, Prowers, Otero, Baca		60,067	10,000
District X	Delta, Gunnison, Hinsdale, Montrose, San Miguel, Ouray		44,430	10,000
San Juan Basin COG	Montezuma, La Plata, San Juan, Dolores, Archuleta		44,430	10,000
Colorado West COG	Moffat, Rio Blanco, Garfield, Mesa		33,680	14,300
Northwest COG	Routt, Jackson, Grand, Eagle, Pitkin, Summitt		36,614	10,000
San Luis Valley Regional Planning and Development Commission	Saguache, Mineral, Rio Grande Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla		52,247	10,000

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE COLORADO (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
District VII	Las Animas, Huerfano, Pueblo, Custer, Fremont, Chaffee, Lake		54,201	10,000
District III	Boulder, Denver, Gilpin, Clear Creek, Jefferson, Douglas, Arapahoe, Adams		---	9,000
District IV	Park, Teller, El Paso		---	5,000
		<u>\$505,174*</u>	<u>\$437,021</u>	<u>\$124,300</u>

*Grantees not available.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE CONNECTICUT

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Litchfield Hills RPA	Litchfield (part)	\$ 27,400	\$ 25,000	\$ 20,000
Valley Regional Planning Agency	Fairfield, New Haven (part)	29,900	25,000	20,000
Mid-State RPA	Middlesex (part)	29,900	25,000	20,000
Windham RPA	Windham (part), Tolland, New London (part)	29,900	25,000	25,450
Northeast Connecticut RPA	Windham (part)	27,400	25,000	25,250
Connecticut River Estuary RPA	Middlesex (part), New London (part)	27,400	25,000	24,850
Northwestern Connecticut RPA	Litchfield (part)	---	20,000	20,000
Technical Assistance to Non- metro Agencies		10,100		
		<u>\$182,000</u>	<u>\$170,000</u>	<u>\$155,550</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE FLORIDA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Northwest Florida Regional Council and Economic Devel- opment District	Bay, Walton, Holmes, Washington, Jackson, Calhoun, Gulf, Liberty, Franklin, Gadsden, Wakulla	\$ 50,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 48,713
		---	---	16,000
		<u>\$ 50,000</u>	<u>\$ 65,000</u>	<u>\$ 64,713</u>
Withlacoochee Regional Planning Council	Citrus, Hernando, Levy, Marion, Sumter			

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE GEORGIA (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Altamaha Georgia Southern APDC	Appling, Bulloch, Candler, Evans, Tattnall, Toombs, Wayne, Jeff Davis	\$ 47,589	\$ 23,351	\$ 18,573
Central Savannah River APDC	Burke, Columbia, Emanuel, Glascock, Jefferson, Jenkins, McDuffie, Richmond, Screven, Lincoln, Warren, Talifer and Wilkes	57,000	23,349	18,879
Chattahoochee Flint APDC	Carroll, Heard, Troup, Meriwether, Coweta	---	23,349	26,192
Coastal APDC	Bryan, Camden, Chatham, Effingham, Glynn, Liberty, Long, McIntosh	31,688	23,351	18,573
Coastal Plain APDC	Berrien, Ben Hill, Brooks, Cook, Tift, Echols, Irwin, Lanier, Lowndes, Turner	69,000	26,802	26,192
Coosa Valley APDC	Bartow, Catoosa, Chattooga, Dade, Floyd, Gordon, Haralson, Paulding, Polk, Walker	18,920	30,612	30,457
Georgia Mountains APDC	Banks, Dawson, Forsyth, Franklin, Habersham, Hall, Hart, Lumpkin, Rabun, Stephens, Towns, Union, White	22,575	23,349	26,192

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE GEORGIA (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Heart of Georgia PDC	Bleckley, Dodge, Laurens, Montgomery, Pulaski, Telfair, Treutlen, Wheeler, Wilcox	\$ 27,438	\$ 20,132	\$ ---
McIntosh Trail APDC	Butts, Fayette, Henry, Lamar, Newton, Pike, Spalding, Upson	52,680	23,349	18,879
Middle Flint APDC	Crisp, Dooly, Macon, Marion, Schley, Sumter, Taylor, Webster	55,181	23,349	18,573
North Georgia APDC	Cherokee, Fannin, Gilmer, Murray, Pickens, Whitfield	15,800	26,802	18,879
Northeast Georgia APDC	Jackson, Barrow, Madison, Elbert, Walton, Green, Clark, Morgan, Oconee, Oglethorpe	23,749	26,802	24,364
Oconee APDC	Baldwin, Hancock, Jasper, Johnson Putnam, Washington, Wilkinson	22,999	23,349	18,573
Slash Pine APDC	Atkinson, Bacon, Brantley, Charlton, Clinch, Coffee, Pierce, Ware	56,250	38,234	21,623
Southwest Georgia PDC	Baker, Calhoun, Colquitt, Decatur, Dougherty, Early, Grady, Lee, Miller, Mitchell, Seminole, Terrell, Thomas, Worth	19,070	26,803	18,573
		<u>\$519,939</u>	<u>\$382,983</u>	<u>\$304,522</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE IDAHO (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Panhandle Regional Planning and Development Council	Boundary, Bonner, Kootenai, Benewah, Shoshone		\$ 16,000	\$ 31,500
Clearwater Economic Develop- ment Association	Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis, Nez Perce		17,000	19,000
Ida-Ore Economic Planning and Development Association	Idaho: Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Owyhee, Payette, Valley, Washington Oregon: Harney, Malheur		15,750	31,500
*South Idaho Resource Planning and Development Association	Twin Falls, Jerome, Minidoka, Cassia		23,000	----
*Wood River Resource Council of Governments	Blaine, Camas, Gooding, Lincoln		19,000	19,000
Southeast Idaho Council of Governments	Bingham, Power, Bannock, Caribou, Oneida, Franklin, Bear Lake		19,000	----

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA-WIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE IDAHO (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Upper Valley Resource Planning Council	Clark, Fremont, Madison, Teton		\$ 19,000	\$ ---
*Magic Valley Association of Governments	Blaine, Camas, Gooding, Lincoln, Twin Falls, Jerome, Minidoka, Cassia		---	26,000
			<u>\$128,750</u>	<u>\$127,000</u>
*S. Idaho RPDA merged with Wood River RPCOG to form Magic Valley Association of Governments.				

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE ILLINOIS (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Greater Egypt Regional Planning Commission	Jefferson, Perry, Franklin, Jackson, Williamson	\$ 48,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 28,500
Greater Wabash RPC	White, Edwards, Wabash, Wayne	18,000	38,066	26,000
Mississippi-Ohio Regional Planning and Development Commission	Alexander, Pulaski, Johnson, Massac, Union	25,882	44,002	22,000
Embarras Valley RP&DC	Clay, Crawford, Jasper, Lawrence, Richland	30,000	34,000	20,000
Southeastern Illinois RPC	Hamilton, Hardin, Saline, Pope, Gallatin	26,000	32,000	20,000
Kankakee County RPC	Kankakee	---	10,050	---
Vermilion County RP&DC	Vermilion	---	20,000	---
Coles County RPC	Coles	---	25,000	---

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE ILLINOIS (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
South Central Regional Planning and Development Commission	Effingham, Fayette, Marion	---	---	20,000
Northwest Illinois Regional Council of Public Officials	Jo Daviess, Carroll, Whiteside	---	---	21,000
West Central Illinois Regional Council of Public Officials	Warren, Henderson, Hancock, Knox, McDonough, Fulton	---	---	21,000
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		<u>\$147,882</u>	<u>\$290,118</u>	<u>20,826</u>
				<u>\$199,326</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE INDIANA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Region IB - Kankakee-Iroquis Regional Planning Commission	Jasper, Newton, Starke, Pulaski		\$ 26,601	\$ 27,352
Region 5 - Development Commission	Fulton, Wabash, Miami, Cass**, Tipton**, and Howard		19,998	22,075
Region 9 - Development Commission	Wayne, Union, Rush, Fayette, Franklin		21,200	24,597
Region II - Development Commission	Decatur, Jennings**, Brown, Bartholomew, Jackson		19,600	13,413
Region 12 - Development Commission	Ripley, Dearborn, Ohio, Switzerland, Jefferson		14,936	25,406
Region 15 - Lake Patoka Regional Planning Commission	Orange, Crawford, Dubois, Perry, Spencer		22,500	19,600
Region 14 - Development Commission	Clark, Floyd, Harrison, Scott, Washington		---	17,557
			<u>\$124,835</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>

**Not member of the Region

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE IOWA (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Southern Iowa Regional Planning Commission (RPC)	Adair, Adams, Clarke, Decatur, Ringgold, Taylor, Union	\$ 40,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 13,500
Mid-Iowa RPC	Hamilton, Humboldt, Pocahontas, Webster, Calhoun, Wright	16,000	23,000	13,500
Tenco RPC	Appanoose, Davis, Jefferson, Keokuk, Lucas, Mahaska, Monroe, Van Buren, Wapello, Wayne	24,000	20,000	---
Northern Iowa Area Development COG	Cerro Gordo, Floyd, Franklin, Hancock, Kossuth, Mitchell, Winnebago, Worth	---	20,000	13,500
West Central Iowa RPC	Audubon, Carroll, Crawford, Greene, Guthrie, Sac	---	20,000	13,500
Upper Explorerland RPC	Allamakee, Clayton, Howard, Winneschiek, Fayette	---	23,000	13,500
Northwest Iowa COG	Buena Vista, Clay, Dickenson, Emmett, Lyons, O'Brien, Osceola, Palo Alto, Sioux	---	---	13,500

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE IOWA (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Area VI RPC Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies	Hardin, Marshall, Poweshiek, Tama	\$ ---	\$ ---	\$ 14,250
				53,506
		<u>\$ 80,000</u>	<u>\$ 148,000</u>	<u>\$ 162,256</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE KANSAS (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Greater Northwest Regional Planning Commission (RPC)	Cheyenne, Sherman, Wallace, Thomas, Decatur, Rawlins, Sheridan, Logan, Gove, Norton, Phillips, Smith, Graham, Rooks, Osborne, Trego, Ellis, Russell	\$ 25,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 17,600
Big Lakes RPC	Riley, Pottawatomie, Geary	25,000	10,000	5,000
Flint Hills RPC	Morris, Lyon, Chase, Marion	25,000	10,000	17,000
Greater Southwest RPC	Clark, Finney, Ford, Grant, Gray, Greeley, Hamilton, Haskell, Hodgeman, Kearny, Lane, Meade, Morton, Ness, Scott, Seward, Stanton, Stevens, Wichita	---	30,000	17,600
Chikaskia RPC	Harper, Kingman, Sumner	21,000	10,000	8,800
Indian Hills RPC	Barber, Comanche, Kiowa, Pratt	---	10,000	8,800
Southeast RPC	Allen, Bourbon, Cherokee, Crawford, Labette, Montgomery, Neosho, Wilson, Woodson	20,000	30,000	17,600
Blue Stem RPC	Cowley, Greenwood, Elk, Chautauqua	---	---	5,000

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE KANSAS (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
North Central RPC	Cloud, Ellsworth, Jewell, Lincoln, Mitchell, Republic, Saline, Ottawa	\$ ---	\$ 10,000	\$ 17,600
Mid-State RPC	Rice, McPherson, Reno	---	---	15,000
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		29,000		26,500
		<u>\$145,000</u>	<u>\$140,000</u>	<u>\$156,500</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA-WIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE KENTUCKY (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Cumberland Valley Area Development District	Rockcastle, Jackson, Laurel, Clay, Knox, Whitley, Bell, Harlan	\$ 30,000	\$ ---	\$ 18,240
Northern Kentucky ADD	Kenton, Campbell, Boone, Gallatin, Carroll, Owen, Grant, Pendleton	69,000	---	34,595
Barren River ADD	Allen, Barren, Butler, Edmundson, Warren, Logan, Metcalfe, Monroe, Hart, Simpson	24,000	---	16,240
Fivco ADD	Boyd, Carter, Greenup, Elliot, Lawrence	24,000	---	14,515
Purchase ADD	Ballard, Galloway, Fulton, Hickman, Graves, Marshall, McCracken, Carlisle	39,000	---	13,825
Lake Cumberland ADD	Adair, Casey, Clinton, Cumberland, Green, McCreary, Pulaski, Russell, Taylor, Wayne	24,000	---	30,965
Green River ADD	Union, Webster, Henderson, Davis, McLean, Ohio, Hancock	---	---	10,300

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE KENTUCKY (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency	Floyd and Clark, Trimble, Oldham, Jefferson, Bullitt, Henry, Spencer, Shelby	\$ ---	\$ ---	\$ 12,510
Buffalo Trace ADD	Louis, Fleming, Mason, Bracken, Robertson	---	---	12,305
Gateway ADD	Morgan, Rowan, Menifee, Bath, Montgomery	---	---	13,960
Lincoln Trail ADD	Breckinridge, Grayson, Hardin, Larue, Marion, Meade, Nelson, Washington	36,000	---	15,890
Pennyrile ADD	Caldwell, Christian, Crittenden, Hopkins, Livingston, Lyon, Muhlenburg, Todd, Trigg	29,000	---	15,480
Blue Grass ADD	Scott, Fayette, Lexington, Harrison, Nicholas, Bourbon, Clark, Powell, Estell, Madison, Garrard, Lincoln, Boyle, Mercer, Anderson, Woodford, Franklin	---	---	22,040

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE Kentucky (3)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Commonwealth of Kentucky, Office of Local Government		\$ ----	\$288,155	\$ ----
Kentucky River ADD	Wolfe, Lee, Owsley, Breathitt, Leslie, Perry, Letcher, Knott	----	----	20,310
Big Sandy ADD	Pike, Martin, Floyd, Johnson, Magoffin	----	----	13,825
		<u>\$275,000</u>	<u>\$288,155</u>	<u>\$265,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE LOUISIANA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Northwest Louisiana Regional Planning Commission (RPC)	Webster, Claiborne, Bienville, Lincoln, De Soto, Red River, Sabine, Natchitoches, Bossier, Caddo	\$ 30,251	\$ 30,105	\$ 29,000
North Delta RPC	Union, Morehouse, West Carroll, Ouachita, East Carroll, Richland, Madison, Caldwell, Franklin, Jackson, Tensas	30,251	30,105	29,000
Kisatchie-Delta RPC	Avoyelles, Catahoula, Concordia, Grant, LaSalle, Rapides, Vernon, Winn	30,251	30,105	29,000
Evangeline RPC	Vermillion, Acadia, Evangeline, St. Landry, St. Martin, Iberia, St. Mary, Lafayette	20,000	26,103	29,000
South Central Regional Planning and Development Commission	LaFourche, Assumption, St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Charles Terrebonne	20,000	22,000	29,000
Sabine RPC*	Beauregard, Jefferson Davis,* Cameron, Allen, Calcasieu	12,000	20,103	---
		<u>\$142,753</u>	<u>\$158,521</u>	<u>\$145,000</u>

*These parishes in the Sabine Regional Planning Commission have joined with Calcasieu Parish (an SMSA) to form a Metropolitan Regional Planning body. They are, therefore, no longer in the Non-Metropolitan category.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MAINE (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Eastern Maine District Hancock County RPC	Hancock County (part)	\$ 8,094	\$ 13,000	\$ 9,003
Washington County RPC	Penobscot County (part) Washington County (part)	---	11,000	7,591
Kennebec District Northern Kennebec RPC	Parts of the following counties: Franklin, Kennebec, Somerset, Waldo	26,359	21,000	14,536
South Kennebec Valley RPC	Parts of the following counties: Kennebec, Lincoln, Sagadahoc	24,727	13,400	9,291
Mid-Coastal District Eastern Mid-Coast RPC	Knox County, Waldo County (part)	10,000	11,700	8,106
Southern Mid-Coast RPC	Parts of the following counties: Cumberland, Sagadahoc, Lincoln	23,959	17,600	12,223
Northern Maine RPC	Parts of the following counties: Aroostock, Penobscot, Somerset, Piscataquis, Washington	29,051	28,000	19,511

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MAINE (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Southern Maine RPC	Parts of the following counties: Cumberland, Oxford, York	\$ 29,383	\$ 30,700	\$ 21,378
Penobscot Valley RPC	Parts of the following counties: Hancock, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, Waldo, Washington	28,427	33,600	23,361
Technical Assistance to Non-Metro Agencies		<u>\$180,000</u>	<u>\$180,000</u>	<u>24,000</u>
				<u>\$149,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MARYLAND

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Tri County Council for Southern Maryland	Charles, Calvert, St. Mary's	\$ 66,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Frederick County Council of Governments	Frederick	35,000	---	---
Tri County Council for Western Maryland	Allegheny, Garrett, Washington	---	19,000	8,800
		<u>\$101,000</u>	<u>\$ 34,000</u>	<u>\$ 23,800</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MASSACHUSETTS

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS			
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974	
Cape Cod Planning and Economic Development Commission	Barnstable	\$ 32,333	\$ 27,000	\$ 24,315	
Franklin County Planning Board	Franklin	28,333	25,000	24,355	
Dukes County Planning and Economic Development Commission	Dukes	21,334	28,000	21,330	
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		3,000			
		<u>\$ 85,000</u>	<u>\$ 80,000</u>	<u>\$ 70,000</u>	

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MICHIGAN

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Northwest Michigan Regional Planning Commission	Emmett, Charlevoix, Antrim, Kalkaska, Missaukee, Grand Traverse, Wexford, Leelanau, Benzie, Manistee	\$ 30,000	\$ 35,712	\$ 40,800
Northeast Michigan RPC	Cheboygan, Otsego, Crawford, Presque Isle, Montgomery, Oscoda, Alpena, Alcona	30,000	29,000	37,700
Central Upper Peninsula RPC	Marquette, Dickinson, Menominee, Delta, Alger, Schoolcraft	40,000	36,000	77,300
Eastern Upper Peninsula RPC	Luce, Chippewa, Mackinac	30,000	25,000	22,700
Western Upper Peninsula RPC	Baraga, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw, Ontonagon	35,000	31,000	37,500
		<u>\$165,000</u>	<u>\$156,712</u>	<u>\$216,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MINNESOTA (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Headwaters Regional Development Commission (Region 2)	Beltrami, Clearwater, Hubbard, Lake of the Woods, Mahnomen	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
Arrowhead RDC (Region 3)	Aitkin, Carlton, Cook, Itasca, Koochiching, Lake, St. Louis	45,000	55,000	60,000
Minnesota River Valley Council of Governments	Brown, Blue Earth, LeSueur, Nicollet	20,000	18,000	---
Region 10 RDC	Mower, Rice, Steele-Freeborn, Goodhue, Dodge, Wabasha, Olmsted, Fillmore, Winona, Houston	15,000	10,000	15,000
Region 9 RDC	Blue Earth, Brown, LeSueur, Nicollet, Faribault, Sibley, Waseca, Watonwan, Martin	20,000	32,000	32,000
Southeast Minnesota Area Planning Organization	Goodhue, Wabasha, Winona, Fillmore (part), Houston (part)	---	12,433	11,685
**Northwest RDC (Region 1)	Kittson, Roseau, Marshall, Pennington, Red Lake, Polk, Norman	---	---	10,000
An agency was in the process of being formed		20,000	---	---

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA-WIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MINNESOTA (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
**West Central RDC (Region 4)	Clay, Wilkin, Traverse, Becker, Ottertail, Grant, Stevens, Douglas, Pope	\$ ---	\$ ---	\$ 10,000
**Region 5 - RDC	Wadena, Cass, Crow Wing, Morrison, Todd	---	---	2,500
**Region 6W - RDC	Big Stone, Swift, Lac Qui Parle, Yellow Medicine, Chippewa	---	---	2,500
**Region 6E - RDC	Renville, Kandiyohi, Meeker, McLeod	---	---	2,500
Region 7W - RDC	Stearns, Wright, Benton, Shurburne	---	---	3,989
**Region 7E - RDC	Mille Lacs, Kanabec, Isanti, Pine, Chisago	---	---	2,500
**Southwest RDC (Region 8)	Lincoln, Pipestone, Rock, Lyon, Murray, Redwood, Cottonwood, Jackson, Nobles	---	---	5,000
**Agencies in the process of being formed		<u>\$140,000</u>	<u>\$147,433</u>	<u>\$177,674</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA-WIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MISSISSIPPI (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Southern Mississippi Economic Development District	Covington, Forrest, George, Greene, Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, Jefferson Davis, Jones, Lamar, Marion, Pearl River, Perry, Stone, Wayne	\$ 40,000	\$ 42,068	\$ 35,107
Golden Triangle Planning and Development District	Webster, Clay, Choctaw, Oktibbeha, Lowndes, Winston, Noxubee	31,000	41,561	32,400
Southwest Mississippi Planning and Development District	Adams, Amite, Claiborne, Franklin, Jefferson, Lawrence, Lincoln, Pike, Walthall, Wilkinson	40,000	35,600	33,720
South Delta PDD	Bolivar, Humphreys, Issaquena, Sharkey, Sunflower, Washington	25,000	27,980	22,970
Northeast Mississippi Planning and Development District	Marshall, Benton, Tippah, Alcorn, Tishomingo, Prentiss	31,000	25,230	15,635
Three Rivers PDD	Lafayette, Union, Lee, Pontotoc, Itawamba, Calhoun, Chickasaw, Monroe	31,000	24,140	16,372
East Central Mississippi PDD	Leake, Neshoba, Kemper, Scott, Newton, Lauderdale, Smith, Jasper, Clark	31,000	27,596	26,939
North Delta PDD	DeSoto, Tate, Panola, Tunica, Quitman, Coahoma, Tallahatchie	25,000	24,935	20,379

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MISSISSIPPI (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Central Mississippi PDD	Copiah, Hinds, Madison, Rankin, Simpson, Warren, Yazoo	\$42,000 divided between two districts	\$ 26,321	\$ 29,657
North Central Mississippi	Attala, Carroll, Grenada, Holmes, Leflore, Montgomery, Yalobusha	---	28,889	25,394
*Lee County Council of Governments (COG)	Lee	---	44,000	---
**Pike County (COG)	Pike	---	16,000	---
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies			31,393	
		<u>\$296,500</u>	<u>\$395,713</u>	<u>\$258,573</u>
*Part of Three Rivers PDD				
**Part of Southwest Miss. PDD				

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MISSOURI (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Ozark Gateway RPC	Barton, Jasper, Newton, McDonald	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 44,000
Ozark Foothills RPC	Reynolds, Wayne, Carter, Butler, Ripley	21,000	22,500	21,000
Bootheel RPC	Pemiscot, Dunklin, Stoddard, Scott, Mississippi, New Madrid	24,000	24,000	24,000
Boonslick RPC	Lincoln, Montgomery, Warren	16,000	15,000	14,000
Southeast Missouri RPC	Perry, Cape Girardeau, Ste- Genevieve, Bollinger, Iron, Madison, St. Francois	24,000	22,500	22,500
Missouri Valley RPC	Carroll, Saline, Chariton	15,000	16,000	16,000
Mark Twain RPC	Lewis, Marion, Shelby, Macon, Randolph, Monroe, Ralls, Pike	20,000	20,000	18,000
Northeast Missouri RPC	Schuyler, Scotland, Clark, Adair, Knox	18,000	18,000	18,000
Green Hills RPC	Harrison, Mercer, Putnam, Sullivan, Grundy, Daviess, Caldwell, Livingston, Linn	21,000	21,000	21,000
Northwest Missouri RPC	Atchinson, Holt, Nodaway, Worth, Gentry	18,000	16,000	18,000

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MISSOURI (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Kaysinger Basin	Bates, Henry, Benton, St. Clair, Hickory, Cedar, Vernon	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 22,500
Lake of the Ozarks RPC	Morgan, Miller, Pulaski, Iacledede, Camden	15,000	18,000	16,000
Meramec RPC	Gasconade, Maries, Phelps, Dent, Crawford, Washington	21,000	21,000	18,000
Show Me RPC	Lafayette, Johnson, Pettis	18,000	19,000	20,000
South Central Ozark RPC	Wright, Texas, Shannon, Douglas, Ozark, Howell, Oregon	24,000	24,000	21,000
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		30,000	46,961	57,000
		<u>\$328,000</u>	<u>\$346,961</u>	<u>\$371,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE MONTANA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Deer Lodge County Planning Commission	Deer Lodge	\$ 31,875	\$ ---	\$ ---
Musselshell County PC	Musselshell	12,066	---	---
Flathead County PC	Flathead	48,916	---	---
Madison County PC	Madison	15,083	---	---
State Planning Agency*	Big Horn, Carbon, Deer Lodge, Flathead, Granite, Lewis & Clark, Lincoln, Meagher, Missoula, Ravalli	---	235,933	---
State Planning Agency*	Lewis & Clark County	---	---	15,000
	Flathead County	---	---	15,000
	Deer Lodge County	---	---	7,000
	Missoula County	---	---	15,000
Bear Paw Development Commission	Hill, Blaine, Liberty	---	---	7,650
*Individual counties con- sidered districts due to size		<u>\$107,940</u>	<u>\$235,933</u>	<u>\$ 59,650</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NEBRASKA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Extra Metropolitan Council of Governments (COG)	Dodge, Burt, Thurston	\$ 9,200	\$ 25,000	\$ ---
Nebraska Panhandle Resource Conservation and Development Planning Council	Banner, Box Butte, Cheyenne, Dawes Deuel, Garden, Kinball, Morrill, Scotts Bluff, Sheridan, Sioux	13,300	35,000	---
West Central COG	Lincoln, Logan, Thomas, Hooker, McPherson, Perkins, Grant, Arthur, Keith, Chase	9,300	25,000	---
Southeast Nebraska COG	Johnston, Nemaha, Pawnee, Richardson	---	16,471	---
River Country COG	Cass, Otoe	---	18,688	---
Buffalo County COG	Buffalo	---	16,471	---
Tri-County COG	Cedar, Dixon, Knox	---	17,804	---
Vision 17 Areawide Planning Agency	Saunders, Cass, Otoe, Gage, Johnson, Nemaha, Pawnee, Richardson, Jefferson, Thayer, Saline, Seward, Butler, Polk, York, Fillmore	---	---	16,561
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		28,190		61,068
		<u>\$ 59,990</u>	<u>\$154,434</u>	<u>\$ 94,191</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NEVADA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Central Nevada Development Authority	Churchill (part), Lander (part), Eureka (part), Nye (part), Esmeralda	\$ ---	\$ ---	\$ ---
Carson River Basin Council of Governments	Carson City, Douglas, Churchill, Storey, Lyon	41,000	24,000	6,000
		<u>\$ 41,000</u>	<u>\$ 24,000</u>	<u>\$ 6,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NEW HAMPSHIRE (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
*Southeast New Hampshire RFC (Region 16)	Rockingham (part) Portsmouth City, Hampton Town, Greenland Town, Newington Town, North Hampton Town, Rye Town, Exeter Town, Stratham Town	Portion of \$ 86,600	\$ ---	\$ ---
Central New Hampshire RPC	Merrimack County (part), Concord City, Boscawen Town, Bow Town, Centerbury Town, Hopkinton Town, Henniker Town, Allenstown Town, Pembroke Town	28,000	28,500	23,000
*Strafford RPC	Strafford County (part) Somersworth City, Dover Town, Durham Town, Madbury Town, Newmarket Town, Rollinsford Town	Portion of 86,600	---	---
*Salem Commission (Region 15)	Rockingham County (part) Plaistow Town, Windham Town, Salem Town, Newton Town, Atkinson Town	Portion of 86,600	---	---
Lakes Regional Planning Commission	Carroll (part), Belknap (part)	28,000	28,500	23,000

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NEW HAMPSHIRE (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Upper Valley Lake Suepee Regional Council	New Hampshire (portion) Grafton County (part) Sullivan County (part) Vermont (portion) Windsor County (part) Orange County (part)	\$ 33,000	\$ 28,500	\$ 23,000
North Country Council	Coos, Carroll (part), Grafton (part)	23,800	40,000	23,000
Southwestern New Hampshire RPC	Cheshire (part)	17,700	28,500	23,000
*Region 6 Coordinating Committee Southeast Strafford RPC Southern Rockingham RPC	Rockingham (part) Strafford (part) Rockingham (part)	---	85,500	65,000
*Now known as Strafford Rockingham RPC		<u>\$217,100</u>	<u>\$239,500</u>	<u>\$180,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NEW MEXICO

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
North Central New Mexico Economic Development District (EDD)	Rio Arriba, Taos, Colfax, Mora, Los Alamos, Santa Fe, San Miguel, Sandoval	\$ ---	\$ 46,500	\$ 36,800
Southwest New Mexico COG	Catron, Grant, Hidalgo, Luna	---	35,000	27,700
Southern Rio Grande COG	Dona Ana, Socorro, Sierra	---	43,000	34,000
Southeastern New Mexico Economic Development District (EDD)	Chaves, Eddy, Lea, Lincoln, Otero	---	46,500	36,800
San Juan COG	San Juan	---	30,000	23,700
McKinley COG	McKinley	---	30,000	23,700
Eastern Plains Planning Commission	Curry, DeBaca, Guadalupe, Harding, Quay, Union, Roosevelt	234,328 Breakdown to be determined by the State	36,825	29,100
		<u>\$234,328</u>	<u>\$267,825</u>	<u>\$211,800</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NEW YORK

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Lake Champlain-Lake George Regional Planning Commission	Washington, Warren, Hamilton, Essex, Clinton	\$ 40,200	\$ 48,504	\$ 48,000
Black River-St. Lawrence Regional Planning Board	Franklin, St. Lawrence, Jefferson, Lewis	59,689	64,044	64,044
Southern Tier Central Regional Planning and Development Board	Chemung, Steuben, Schuyler	26,400	61,470	18,375
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		5,700		
		<u>\$131,989</u>	<u>\$174,018</u>	<u>\$130,419</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NORTH CAROLINA (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS			
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974	
Western Piedmont Council of Governments	Alexander, Burke, Caldwell, Catawba	\$ 42,000	\$ 54,000	\$ 46,800	
Kerr-Tar Regional COG	Franklin, Granville, Person, Vance, Warren	20,000	30,000	26,100	
Neuse River COG	Wayne, Greene, Lenoir, Craven, Jones, Duplin, Onslow, Carteret, Pamlico	31,000	43,500	37,800	
Mid-East Economic Development Commission	Beaufort, Bertie, Hertford, Pitt, Martin	21,300	30,000	26,100	
Isothermal Planning and Development Commission	Cleveland, McDowell, Polk, Rutherford	20,000	30,000	26,100	
Southwestern North Carolina Planning and Economic Development Commission	Cherokee, Haywood, Clay, Macon, Graham, Swain, Jackson	15,000	20,000	18,300	
Blue Ridge Mountain Scenic Planning and Development Commission	Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, Yancey, Alleghany, Ashe, Wilkes	15,000	21,700	18,000	
Region "I" COG	Edgecombe, Halifax, Nash, Northhampton, Wilson	25,000	28,606	27,600	

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NORTH CAROLINA (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Region "N" COG	Bladen, Hoke, Robeson, Scotland	\$ 25,000	\$ 28,500	\$ 24,900
Pee Dee COG	Montgomery, Moore, Richmond, Anson	21,000	30,000	26,000
Albemarle Regional PDC	Currituck, Camden, Gates, Dare, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Chowan, Washington, Tyrrell, Hyde	15,000	22,500	19,800
Technical Assistant to Non- Metro Agencies		5,000	3,164	
		<u>\$255,300</u>	<u>\$341,970</u>	<u>\$297,500</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE NORTH DAKOTA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
District 1	Divide, Williams, McKenzie	\$ ---	\$ ---	\$ 12,000
District 2	Burke, Mountrail, Ward, Renville, Bottineau, McHenry, Pierce	---	---	22,500
District 3	Rollette, Towner, Cavalier, Benson, Ramsey, Eddy	16,000	25,160	23,000
District 4	Pembina, Walsh, Nelson, Grand Forks	16,000	17,150	12,000
District 5	Steele, Traill, Cass, Ranson, Sargent, Richland	16,000	25,160	36,750
District 6	Wells, Foster, Griggs, Stutsman, Barnes, Logan, LaMoure, McIntosh, Dickey	---	25,175	21,500
District 7	McLean, Mercer, Oliver, Morton, Grant, Sioux, Emmons, Kidder, Burleigh, Sheridan	20,300	28,788	40,500
District 8	Golden Valley, Billings, Stark, Slope, Hettinger, Dunn, Bowman, Adams	---	17,150	22,866
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		\$ 68,300	\$138,583	\$196,344

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE OHIO

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Buckeye Hills Hocking Valley Regional Development District, Inc.	Belmont, Monroe, Noble, Morgan, Washington, Perry, Athens, Meigs, Hocking	\$ 30,000	---	\$ 9,500
Maumee Valley RC&D	Williams, Defiance, Paulding, Henry, Fulton	---	---	6,000
Region 5a RLO	Marion, Wyandotte, Seneca, Huron, Crawford	---	---	7,000
Ohio Valley Regional Develop- ment Commission	Brown, Highland, Ross, Pike, Adams, Scioto, Lawrence, Gallia, Vinton, Jackson	---	---	14,000
Tuscarawas Valley RAC	Holmes, Coshocton, Muskingum, Tuscarawas, Guernsey, Carroll, Jefferson, Harrison, Belmont	---	---	13,500
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		\$ 30,000	---	111,000
			---	\$161,000

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE OKLAHOMA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Northeast Counties of Oklahoma Economic Development District	Craig, Delaware, Mayes, Nowata, Ottawa, Rogers, Washington	\$ 33,032	\$ 29,000	\$ 23,239
Eastern Oklahoma EDD	Adair, Cherokee, McIntosh, Wagoner, Muskogee, Okmulgee, Sequoyah	36,000	30,000	23,239
Kiamichi EDD	Choctaw, Haskell, Latimer, LeFlore, McCurtain, Pittsburg, Pushmataha	33,000	29,000	22,664
Southern Oklahoma Development Association	Atoka, Bryan, Carter, Coal, Garvin, Johnston, Love, Marshall, Murray, Pontotoc	34,000	29,000	23,264
Central Oklahoma EDD	Hughes, Lincoln, Okfuskee, Pawnee, Payne, Pottawatomie, Seminole	35,000	30,000	23,539
Northern Oklahoma Development Association	Alfalfa, Blaine, Garfield, Grant, Kay, Kingfisher, Major, Noble	34,000	28,000	23,164
Southwestern Oklahoma Development Association	Beckham, Custer, Greer, Harmon, Jackson, Kiowa, Roger Mills, Washita	31,000	28,000	22,239
Oklahoma Economic Development Association	Beaver, Cimarron, Dewey, Ellis, Harper, Texas, Woods, Woodward	29,000	27,000	21,352
		<u>\$265,032</u>	<u>\$231,000</u>	<u>\$182,700</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA-WIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE OREGON

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
State Administrative District 4	Linn, Benton, Lincoln	\$ 23,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 16,000
State Administrative District 7	Coos, Curry	20,000	19,500	16,000
State Administrative District 9	Hood River, Wasco, Sherman	13,000	15,000	12,000
State Administrative District 12	Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Wheeler, Grant	10,000	14,000	10,000
State Administrative District 1	Clatsop, Tillamook	18,000	20,000	16,000
State Administrative District 6	Douglas	4,000	5,000	10,000
State Administrative District 8	Jackson, Josephine	13,000	10,000	10,000
State Administrative District 10	Crook, Deschutes, Jefferson	10,000	18,500	14,000
State Administrative District 14	Harney, Malheur	20,000	20,000	16,000
State Administrative District 11	Klamath, Lake	---	10,000	---
State Administrative District 13	Baker, Union, Wallowa	---	14,000	10,000
		<u>\$131,000</u>	<u>\$166,000</u>	<u>\$130,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA-WIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE PENNSYLVANIA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Northern Tier Regional PDC	Bradford, Sullivan, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Tioga	\$ 65,062	\$109,590	\$ 59,432
Mifflin-Juniata Counties	Mifflin, Juniata	18,144	20,100	14,700
Union-Snyder Counties	Union, Snyder	40,912	47,115	21,035
Columbia-Montour Counties	Columbia, Montour	---	34,890	18,257
		<u>\$124,118</u>	<u>\$211,695</u>	<u>\$113,424</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE SOUTH CAROLINA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Upper Savannah Regional Planning and Development Council 2 (RPDC)	Abbeville, Edgefield, Greenwood, Laurens, McCormick, Saluda	\$ 59,900	\$ 26,093	\$ 21,546
Catawba RPC 3	Chester, Lancaster, Union, York	48,998	28,156	23,322
Lower Savannah RPDC 5	Allendale, Barnwell, Bamberg, Calhoun, Orangeburg, Aiken	45,000	30,048	24,950
Santee-Wateree RPC 6	Clarendon, Kershaw, Lee, Sumter	39,625	26,093	21,546
Pee Dee RPDC 7	Chesterfield, Darlington, Dillon, Florence, Marion, Marlboro	25,875	33,488	27,910
Waccamaw RPC 8	Georgetown, Horry, Williamsburg	27,750	24,636	20,288
Lowcountry RPC 10	Beaufort, Colleton, Hampton, Jasper	36,999	22,481	18,438
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		43,620		
		<u>\$327,767</u>	<u>\$190,995</u>	<u>\$158,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE SOUTH DAKOTA

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Model Rural Development District I	Brookings, Clark, Codington, Deuel, Grant, Hamlin, Kingsburg, Lake, Moody, Miner	\$173,610 Breakdown determined by State	\$ 60,000	\$ 38,512
District II	McCook, Minnehaha, Turner, Clay, Union, Lincoln		20,000	32,157
District III	Jerauld, Sanborn, Brule, Aurora, Davison, Hanson, Gregory, Bon Homme, Yankton, Hutchinson, Douglas, Charles Mix		60,000	32,157
District IV	McPherson, Brown, Marshall, Roberts, Day, Edmunds, Faulk, Spink, Hand, Beadle		60,000	32,157
District V	Perkins, Haakon, Jones, Lyman, Corson, Buffalo, Tripp, Campbell, Walworth, Ziebach, Dewey, Potter, Mellette, Todd, Hughes, Sully, Stanley, Hyde		60,000	32,157
District VI	Harding, Butte, Meade, Lawrence, Pennington, Custer, Shannon, Bennett, Jackson, Fall River, Washabaugh		90,000	38,511
		<u>\$173,610</u>	<u>\$350,000</u>	<u>\$205,651</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE TENNESSEE

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
First Tennessee-Virginia Development District (DD)	Hancock, Hawkins, Sullivan, Carter, Johnson, Unicoi, Washington, Green (Tenn.), Washington (Va.)	\$ 30,975	\$ 50,666	\$ 47,863
Upper Cumberland DD	Macon, Clay, Pickett, Fentress, White, Overton, Jackson, Smith, Cumberland, Putnam, DeKalb, Cannon, Warren, Van Buren	54,000	55,999	61,612
South Central DD	Hickman, Perry, Wayne, Lewis, Lawrence, Maury, Giles, Marshall, Lincoln, Moore, Bedford, Coffee, Franklin	30,000	29,500	40,379
Northwest Tennessee Planning and Development District	Lake, Obion, Weakley, Henry, Benton, Carroll, Gibson, Dyer, Crockett	22,667	23,333	32,393
Southwest DD	Haywood, Madison, Henderson, Decatur, Hardin, McNairy, Hardeman, Chester	---	20,000	26,753
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		41,665	1,400	
		<u>\$179,307</u>	<u>\$180,898</u>	<u>\$209,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE TEXAS

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Deep East Texas Development Council	Shelby, Nacogdoches, San Augustine, Sabine, Houston, Angelina, Trinity, San Jacinto, Polk, Tyler, Jasper, Newton	\$ 30,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 35,600
Middle Rio Grande Development Council	Val Verde, Edwards, Real, Kinney, Uvalde, Maverick, Zavala, Dimmit, LaSalle	28,000	40,800	33,700
Golden Crescent COG	Victoria, Jackson, Calhoun, Lavaca, DeWitt, Goliad, Gonsales	46,000	50,000	25,500
		<u>\$104,000</u>	<u>\$135,800</u>	<u>\$ 94,800</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE UTAH

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS			
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974	
Six County Commissioner's Organization	Juab, Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, Wayne, Millard	\$ 30,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 5,890	
Bear River Association of Governments	Box Elder, Cache, Rich	24,000	4,000	5,890	
Southeast Utah Economic Development District	Carbon, Emery, Grand, San Juan	14,500	---	5,890	
Five County Association of Governments	Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, Washington	17,500	---	5,890	
Uintah COG	Daggett, Duchesne, Uintah	---	---	5,890	
Bear Lake Commission	NA	---	---	6,017	
		<u>\$ 86,000</u>	<u>\$ 25,000</u>	<u>\$ 35,467</u>	

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE VERMONT (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Windham RP&DC	Windham (part), Bennington (part)	\$ 27,000	\$ 37,700	\$ 30,000
Franklin County RP&DC	Franklin	13,000	19,600	15,000
Chittenden County RPC	Chittenden	46,000	43,000	34,000
Rutland RPC	Rutland (part)	28,000	26,000	20,000
Bennington County RPC	Bennington (part)	18,800	30,100	18,000
Addison RP&DC	Addison (part)	20,000	21,000	13,000
Two Rivers RP&DC	Parts of the following counties: Addison, Orange	16,000	21,000	16,500
Ottawaquechee RP&DC	Windsor (part)	11,000	17,900	12,500
Lemoille County Development Council	Lemoille County	13,000	21,000	15,000
Northeastern Vermont Development Association	Orleans County	25,000	29,500	21,000

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE VERMONT (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Upper Valley P&DC	Vermont (portion) Parts of the following counties: Windsor, Orange	\$ 6,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000
	New Hampshire (portion) Parts of the following counties: Crafton, Sullivan	20,000 Extra Distribution		
	Parts of the following counties: Washington, Orange	11,100	22,500	17,000
Central Vermont RPC	Windsor (part)	13,100	21,000	10,000
		<u>\$268,000</u>	<u>\$318,300</u>	<u>\$230,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE VIRGINIA (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
LENOWISCO Planning District Commission #1	Lee, Scott, Wise	\$ 36,000	\$ 36,000	\$ 20,000
Cumberland Plateau PDC #2	Dickenson, Buchanan, Russell, Tazewell	36,000	36,000	20,000
Mount Rogers PDC #3	Bland, Carroll, Grayson, Washington, Smyth, Wythe; Bristol & Galax Cities	15,000	15,000	30,000
New River Valley PDC #4	Floyd, Giles, Montgomery, Pulaski; Radford City	36,000	46,000	37,980
Lord Fairfax PDC #7	Clarke, Frederick, Page, Shenandoah, Warren; Winchester City	24,000	40,000	20,000
West Piedmont PDC #12	Franklin, Henry, Patrick, Pittsylvania; Danville & Martinsville Cities	46,000	63,900	33,334
RADCO PDC #16	Caroline, King George, Spotsylvania, Strafford; Fredericksburg City	36,000	30,000	20,000
Accomack-Norhampton PDC #22	Accomack, Northampton	25,000	20,000	15,000
Southside PDC #13	Brunswick, Halifax, Mecklenburg; South Boston City	---	15,000	8,200

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA-WIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE VIRGINIA (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Piedmont PDC #14	Amelia, Buckingham, Charlotte, Cumberland, Lunenburg, Nottoway, Prince Edward	\$ ---	\$ 15,000	\$ ---
Thomas Jefferson PDC #10	Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, Nelson	---	47,000	24,467
Middle Peninsula Planning Commission #18	Essex, Gloucester, King and Queen, King William, Mathews, Middlesex	---	---	15,000
Rappahannock-Rapidan #9	Culpeper, Fauquier, Madison, Orange, Rappahannock	---	---	15,000
Technical Assistance to Non- Metro Agencies		<u>\$254,000</u>	<u>58,097</u> <u>\$421,997</u>	<u>\$258,981</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE WASHINGTON

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Providing Technical Assistance for Building Capacity of all Non-Metro Agencies			\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
			<u>\$ 20,000</u>	<u>\$ 20,000</u>

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE WISCONSIN (1)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Mississippi River RPC	Pierce, Buffalo, Trempealeau, LaCrosse, Vernon, Crawford, Jackson, Monroe, Pepin	\$ 25,317	\$ 39,718	\$ 22,900
Northwestern Wisconsin RPC	Bayfield, Ashland, Iron, Price, Burnett, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Washburn, Douglas	22,955	30,068	25,100
Southwestern Wisconsin RPC	Grant, Green, Iowa, Lafayette, Richland	---	30,435	25,500
West Central Wisconsin RPC	Barron, Chippewa, Clark, Dunn, Eau Claire, Polk, St. Croix	---	31,000	23,000
*East Central Wisconsin RPC	Waupaca, Waushara, Marguette, Menominee, Outagamie, Shawano, Winnebago, Calumet, Fond DuLac, Green Lake	51,728	95,637	---
Bay Lakes RPC	Door, Florence, Kewaunee, Manitowoc, Marinette, Oconto, Sheboygan	---	20,000	30,000
*Central Wisconsin RPC	Juneau, Marathon, Portage, Wood	---	20,000	---

* FY 1973 grant allocated on contingency basis pending formation of the
RPC; RPC was not formed and it was decided that the 4 counties would
be included in another RPC.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE WISCONSIN (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
*South Central Wisconsin RPC	Columbia, Sauk, Dodge, Jefferson Rock, Dane	\$ ---	\$ 20,000	\$ ---
**North Central Wisconsin RPC	Vilas, Lincoln, Forest, Wood Juneau, Langlade, Marathon, Oneida, Portage	---	20,000	14,053
		<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>\$296,858</u>	<u>\$140,453</u>

*FY 1973 grant allocated on
contingency basis pending for-
mation of the RPC; RPC was
not formed.

**In process of being formed.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

FY 1972 - 1974

STATE WYOMING (1)

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
Greater Cheyenne Coordinating Council	Laramie	\$ 95,640*	\$ ---	\$ ---
State of Wyoming*	Laramie Cheyenne		18,722	12,500
	Fremont		17,905	---
	Johnson Buffalo		13,921	12,500
	Big Horn, Park County		15,909	15,500
	Carbon Rawlins		15,909	12,500
	Lincoln, Uinta		21,867	17,500
	Sheridan		15,909	---
	Natrona Casper		17,908	12,500
	Albany Laramie		---	12,500

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAWIDE PLANNING AGENCIES

STATE WYOMING (2)

FY 1972 - 1974

AGENCY	Jurisdiction by County	GRANTS		
		FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
*Through the Department of Planning and Economic Development	Green River and Sweetwater Counties		\$ ---	\$ 14,677
	Converse		---	12,500
	Douglas			
		<u>\$ 95,640*</u>	<u>\$138,050</u>	<u>\$122,677</u>

*Through the Department of
Planning and Economic
Development

